Maximum Tongva Population and Last Residents at Guashna/Guaspet, Ballona Wetlands

Ballona Wetlands Ecological Reserve, Playa Vista, California

Historical and Archaeological Synthesis, with Source Verification Note (companion to the Ballona Creek Terminus Report) — v1.31.0

Executive Summary

This report's title reflects the population and occupation-history questions it investigates, not documented findings; no source located for this report establishes a maximum population or identifies specific last residents by name, a limitation stated in full in "What This Report Does Not Claim" below.

Guaspet, also recorded in Mission-era archives under the variant spellings Guasna, Guashna, Guachpet, and Guashpet, was a Gabrielino/Tongva village located within the Ballona lagoon and wetlands complex, at the base of the Westchester Bluffs in present-day Playa Vista, California, approximately 0.5 km (0.3 miles) inland from the Pacific Ocean coastline.[15] The village was not located at any ocean-facing outlet. Ballona Creek did not historically discharge directly into the Pacific Ocean; instead, it emptied into an interior terminal lagoon connected to the sea only through a narrow, intermittently closed tidal inlet well to the west. A direct, permanent engineered connection between the creek and the ocean dates only to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers channelization completed around 1938.[23] The village is archaeologically associated with site CA-LAN-62, at the base of the Westchester Bluffs. Its identity and location were established by Stoll, Douglass, and Ciolek-Torrello (2009) through archival research into Mission San Gabriel and Mission San Fernando registers, Pueblo of Los Angeles records, and later Mexican civil records, correlated with excavation data recovered during the Playa Vista development, and subsequently expanded by Douglass, Reddy, Ciolek-Torello, and Grenda (2014).[1][2]

No census-based maximum population figure for Guaspet exists in the archaeological or ethnohistoric literature reviewed for this report. The closest available proxies are a generic estimate that Tongva villages typically contained roughly two dozen houses (kiiy), and a cumulative Mission-era recruitment count of 92 individuals baptized from Guaspet between 1788 and 1815.[1][6] Neither is a population census, and both are treated below with their respective limitations rather than presented as a documented maximum.

Mission and baptismal records place the end of Guaspet as an independently functioning village at or before 1819.[1][6] Tongva presence in the broader Ballona region continued well beyond that date under mission and rancho conditions; the end of the village is not the end of Tongva presence in the area, and this report states that distinction explicitly rather than leaving it implied.

Archaeological occupation in the vicinity extends back approximately 8,000 years at the earliest bluff-top sites, with a documented gap of roughly 1,500 years in the lowland occupation record, and a Mission-period occupation at CA-LAN-62 extending into the early nineteenth century, including recovered European trade goods.[4] A widely repeated popular claim that the village was continuously occupied from 8,000 B.C. to 1600 A.D. is not supported by the geoarchaeological literature and is addressed and set aside in Section 3.[11][12]

Method of Historical Reconstruction

This report applies a consistent evidentiary hierarchy when weighing sources against one another, from strongest to weakest:

- Primary archival records: sworn government surveys, court-certified maps, mission registers, and land-grant documents.
- Peer-reviewed archaeological and ethnohistoric scholarship, including excavation reports and academic-press monographs.
- Government technical reports prepared for regulatory or engineering purposes.
- Institutional and public-facing summaries, treated as orientation rather than as independent evidence.
- Popular, open-edit, or AI-generated sources, used only to identify claims that require verification, never as evidence for a finding.

Where a claim in this report rests on a lower tier of this hierarchy, that is stated explicitly rather than presented with the confidence of a primary-source finding; see the Source Verification Note preceding the References list for a claim-by-claim accounting.

What This Report Does Not Claim

- No census of Guaspet survives, and no documented maximum population has been published in any source located for this report. Despite the title, this report does not identify a documented maximum population or individually named last residents; it presents bounded population estimates and the latest documented mission-period recruits linked to Guaspet instead.
- No individually identified “last resident” of Guaspet has been confirmed from primary records; the 1819 date discussed in Section 6 concerns the end of village-linked recruitment and baptismal activity, not a named individual or a proven final date of Tongva presence at the site.
- A figure of 193 baptized residents and an occupation range of roughly 1790 to 1820 (Section 5) was attributed by the City of Inglewood EIR to Reddy (2015), now directly read for this report; Reddy’s own text states 92 recruits, not 193, matching every other source used in this report, and does not contain a 193 figure anywhere. The 193 figure’s actual basis remains unknown; this report treats 92 as the better-supported number while disclosing the discrepancy rather than silently adopting either figure as this report’s own finding.
- This report does not treat Wikipedia or other open-edit or AI-generated encyclopedias as evidence for any factual claim. Where such a source is mentioned at all, it is only to identify a claim that this report has checked and explicitly rejected, never to support a claim presented as fact. This report is intended to make every substantive claim traceable to a primary source, a peer-reviewed or academic-press publication, an official government record, or a named institutional source, each listed in the References section with a note on how directly it was verified (see the Source Verification Note preceding the References list). Any future revision to this report must adhere to the same rule: no substantive claim should be introduced on the basis of an open-edit or AI-generated encyclopedia.

1. Geographic and Environmental Setting

Ballona Creek today is an approximately 9-mile channelized watercourse draining approximately 130 square miles of the Santa Monica Mountains, the Baldwin Hills, and the west Los Angeles coastal plain, discharging into Santa Monica Bay between present-day Playa del Rey and Marina del Rey through a concrete flood-control channel completed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers around 1938.[16] Los Angeles County Public Works further subdivides this watershed by jurisdiction: approximately 82.2 percent City of Los Angeles, 4.8 percent unincorporated Los Angeles County, 4.6 percent Beverly Hills, 4.1 percent Culver City, 2.5 percent Inglewood, 1.5 percent West Hollywood, and 0.3 percent Santa Monica.[16] This modern, permanent, direct ocean connection is a twentieth-century engineered condition and should not be projected backward onto the historical period covered by this report.

Historically, throughout the entire span of Guaspet's occupation, Ballona Creek did not discharge directly into the Pacific Ocean. Primary federal survey evidence establishes that the creek instead emptied into an interior terminal lagoon, fed by local watershed runoff and by a documented system of freshwater springs. That lagoon connected to the ocean only through a narrow, intermittently closed tidal inlet well to the west.[23]

Henry Hancock (1857 to 1858), in his U.S. government survey of Rancho La Ballona, as analyzed in the companion Ballona Creek Terminus Report, recorded that "at about 100 chains the Ballona Creek discharges itself into the bay," approximately 6,600 feet (1.25 miles) inland from the inlet. Hancock characterized the lagoon in his official field notes as an "interior lake" whose "connection with the sea is often obstructed," with a measured inlet width of only 5 to 6 feet and a maximum inland lagoon extent of approximately 1.6 miles.[23]

The 1867 to 1868 Courtney court-certified partition map, based directly on Hancock's survey, independently corroborates this picture. It classifies only a narrow coastal fringe as tidal "Lands in Bay," while the interior, including the area around the creek's discharge point, was classified as productive irrigable and dry-farming agricultural land. The lagoon's narrow tidal inlet was located near the coast, in the vicinity of what later became Del Rey Lagoon; the creek's freshwater contribution entered the wetland system significantly to the east of that inlet, not at it.[23]

The Tongva name for the wetlands and estuary landscape as a whole was Pwinukipar, "it is filled with water."[5]

The Guaspet/CA-LAN-62 site area is precisely located, per the excavation report's own project description, approximately 0.5 km (0.3 miles) east of the Pacific Ocean, 1.3 km (0.8 miles) west of the Baldwin Hills, and 1.6 to 2.6 km (1.0 to 1.6 miles) north of Los Angeles International Airport, bounded roughly by Playa del Rey to the west, Marina del Rey to the north, the Ballona Escarpment (Westchester Bluffs) and Del Rey Hills to the south, and Interstate 405 to the east.[15] The village sat at the base of the Westchester Bluffs, on elevated, well-drained ground at the margin of the historic terminal lagoon and floodplain described above, at an elevation of roughly 3.7 to 5 meters (12.2 to 16.5 feet) above mean sea level, with the bluffs rising abruptly to the south to a maximum height of 56 meters (185 feet) above mean sea level.[15] This location gave residents access to marsh, lagoon, creek, and, via the lagoon's tidal inlet to the west, coastal resources, but the village itself sat inland of the lagoon's narrow ocean connection, near the freshwater and creek-fed margin of the wetland system rather than at any ocean-facing outlet. The site's distance from the coastline is a measured figure from the excavation report's project description; its position relative to the lagoon's historic tidal inlet is a reconstruction based on the Hancock survey and Courtney partition map, not an independently surveyed distance to the village itself.[15][23]

Table 1.1 summarizes these reference distances.

The excavation report's own project description indicates that Ballona Creek crossed the broader project area, while Centinela Creek, a spring-fed drainage, ran specifically along the base of the Ballona Escarpment, that is, the Westchester Bluffs themselves, the immediate landform at whose base the village sat.[15] On this basis, the excavation report indicates that Centinela Creek, rather than Ballona Creek, was the drainage immediately adjacent to the village, though both creeks were present in the wider vicinity. Further primary cartographic and photographic documentation of Centinela Creek's historical course, including an annotated reproduction of the 1876 federal T-Sheet 1432B and 1927 and 1934 aerial photography of the Hughes Aircraft and Playa Vista area, is available in a dedicated Internet Archive collection; this report's author verified the collection's metadata and subject matter but was not able to directly read map annotations or photograph captions from within it, so it is cited here as supplementary evidence corroborating, but not independently establishing, the finding above, which rests on Homburg et al. (2014) directly.[24] In modern engineered mapping, Ballona Creek's channelized course may appear closer to the village site than Centinela Creek's historic path; this report follows the excavation report's description of pre-channelization conditions specifically, which place Centinela Creek along the base of the bluffs adjacent to Guaspet, and treats the modern channelized layout as a separate, later condition that should not be read back onto the historical relationship between the village and either creek.

Reference point	Approximate distance and bearing from Guaspet/CA-LAN-62
Pacific Ocean coastline	0.5 km (0.3 mi) west [15]
Baldwin Hills	1.3 km (0.8 mi) east [15]
Los Angeles International Airport	1.6-2.6 km (1.0-1.6 mi) south [15]
Mission San Gabriel	Approximately 22 mi (35 km) northeast [25]
Pueblo de Los Angeles (founded 1781)	Approximately 14 mi (22 km) northeast [25]
Historic lagoon tidal inlet (pre-1938; narrow, intermittently closed; near modern Del Rey Lagoon)	Approximately 2.5-3 km (1.5-2 mi) southwest of the village (estimated from mapped coordinates, not a source-stated figure); Ballona Creek's own discharge point into the interior lagoon was approximately 1.25 mi further inland (east) of that inlet, per Hancock (1857-58) [23]
Modern engineered Ballona Creek ocean outlet (post-1938 USACE channelization)	Same approximate location as the historic inlet above; a twentieth-century engineered feature, not a historical condition present during Guaspet's occupation [23]

Distances to the historic tidal inlet and the modern engineered outlet are estimated from mapped coordinates rather than measured or drawn directly from a cited source; all other distances in this table, including the Mission San Gabriel and Pueblo de Los Angeles distances, are taken directly from the source cited in that row (Reddy 2015, Reference 25). Separately, and not as a citation for these distances, Homburg et al. (2014) Volume 1, p. 41, includes its own cartographic figure (Figure 12, a satellite photograph of the Southern California Bight showing the project area, the Pueblo de Los Angeles, and the missions); this report has not reproduced that

figure and notes it here only as unreproduced corroborating cartography, not as the source of the numbers in this table.

Tongva plank canoes (te'aats, also spelled ti'ats) were built of redwood planks lashed with plant-fiber cordage and sealed at the seams with asphaltum (naturally occurring tar), often mixed with pine pitch, a construction method documented broadly across Tongva and neighboring Chumash territory and still practiced by the modern Ti'at Society.[6][17] Asphaltum was harvested from natural seeps occurring at multiple points across the coastal Los Angeles basin; whether the specific seeps used by Guaspet residents were the deposits later associated with Baldwin Hills, as opposed to other regional sources, is not confirmed by any source located for this report and should not be stated as settled. Guaspet, along with other mainland Tongva communities, maintained maritime trade and travel connections to Pimu (Santa Catalina Island), located more than 20 miles offshore, and to other Channel Islands, exchanging goods including steatite and shell.[6][22] A claim that trade connections from Guaspet specifically reached Pueblo communities in present-day New Mexico appears on Wikipedia's "Guashna" page (not cited as a source in this report; see the Version Block) but could not be confirmed in Stoll, Douglass, and Ciolek-Torrello (2009), in Douglass and Reddy's (2020) chapter, or in any other Ballona archaeological or ethnographic literature checked for this report; it is treated here as unsupported, not as a finding, and should not be repeated in derivative work.

[Photograph not embedded — see source link below]

Figure 1. Ballona Wetlands Ecological Reserve, the lagoon and wetlands landscape (Pwinukipar) surrounding the Guaspet village site.

Photo credit: Vahagn Karapetyan, Google Maps contributor. Source: https://maps.google.com/?cid=4578048982738136696

[Photograph not embedded — see source link below]

Figure 2. Guaspet/CA-LAN-62 (near Ballona Discovery Park) versus the historic terminal lagoon's narrow tidal inlet (near modern Del Rey Lagoon, between Playa del Rey and Marina del Rey), showing the two are distinct locations roughly 1.5 to 2 miles apart. Ballona Creek historically discharged into the interior lagoon east of this inlet, not into the ocean directly; the direct engineered ocean connection shown on modern maps dates only to circa 1938.

Photo credit: Location data: Google Places; distances estimated from mapped coordinates; historical hydrology per the Ballona Creek Terminus Report [23]. Source: https://maps.google.com/?cid=2541119267171813240

Modern public-access reference points nearest to the historic village location: the precise archaeological coordinates of CA-LAN-62 are withheld from this report and from any public mapping to protect the site from disturbance. Ballona Discovery Park, roughly 0.3 miles from the presumed village core, is the nearest publicly accessible location and hosts a monument dedicated to Guaspet/Guashna.[6][21]

2. Archaeological Identification and Site Correlation

The correlation between the archival village name Guaspet and the archaeological site CA-LAN-62 was established through a combined ethnohistoric and archaeological research program conducted by Statistical Research, Inc. as part of the Playa Vista development-related cultural resources program. Before this research, the existence of a village in this vicinity had already been noted in earlier, less certain literature, as recounted directly in Stoll, Douglass, and Ciolek-Torrello (2009): Bernice Johnston's 1962 map of Gabrielino villages

associated the location with the related name Sa'angna, assigning it the village suffix "-ngna" despite finding no mention of that specific term in baptismal records, and John McCawley's 1996 work separately speculated about a possible connection to a village called "Waachnga."[1][3] Stoll, Douglass, and Ciolek-Torrello (2009) demonstrated, through direct Mission San Gabriel, Mission San Fernando, Pueblo of Los Angeles, and Mexican-era civil records, that the documented rancheria was recorded as Guaspet or Guasna, distinct from the Sa'angna and Waachnga naming threads in the earlier, less-supported literature.[1] Accordingly, this report treats Guaspet/Guasna and Sa'angna as distinct names unless future primary evidence demonstrates otherwise; this is a methodological decision for this report, not a claim that the historical question is permanently closed.

Stoll, Douglass, and Ciolek-Torrello (2009) reviewed Mission San Gabriel and Mission San Fernando registers, Pueblo of Los Angeles civil records, and later Mexican-era land records. They confirmed the existence of a rancheria recorded as Guaspet or Guasna in the Ballona, correlating it archaeologically with the CA-LAN-62 site complex.[1] This research was subsequently expanded into a dedicated monograph, Volume 5 of the multi-volume Ballona archaeological synthesis, titled Gabrielino/Tongva Origins and Development: A View from Guaspet.[2]

Land grant records held by the California State Archives, and the surveyed patent plat for Rancho Sausal Redondo, confirm that the Guaspet/Guaspita place-name was carried directly into the Mexican-era land grant system: Antonio Ignacio Ávila received an initial grazing **permit** covering the area in **1822**, and a formal land **grant** patent, confirmed by Governor Juan Alvarado in **1837**, for what was recorded on the surveyed plat as a tract including "the Rancho called Guaspita."[18][19] This 1837 **grant**, distinct from the earlier 1822 **permit**, was later combined with the Rancho Salinas grant and patented as Rancho Sausal Redondo, present-day Westchester, following the U.S. land-claims process that concluded in **1855**.[19] A related but distinct name, Sa'angna (also Saa'angna), is reported in secondary web sources as either a regional referent tied to nearby tar resources or as a separate, nearby settlement; this report could not independently verify that framing against a peer-reviewed source and does not adopt it as a finding, and it should not be treated as interchangeable with Guaspet/Guashna without further verification in this report. The City of Inglewood's cultural resources technical section, obtained and read directly for this report as of v1.21.0, independently corroborates this location: it quotes McCawley (1996, pp. 62-63) describing a historic map of Rancho Sausal Redondo showing "the Mexican land grant of Guaspita located on the east bank of Ballona Creek," on a hill overlooking the creek near the coast, consistent with the land-grant plat evidence already cited above (References 18-20). This is the first specific page citation to McCawley (1996) available to this report; McCawley (1996) itself remains cited secondhand, via [1] and now via [14], and has not been directly retrieved and read.[3][14] The place-name's persistence after the village had ceased functioning as an independent settlement is further attested by Beaule and Douglass (2020), who report that a colonial-era cattle enclosure on the bluffs overlooking the former village and burial area appears on an early map labeled "Corral de Guaspita." This demonstrates only that the place-name persisted in a transformed, utilitarian, rancher's usage; it is not evidence of continuous Gabrielino/Tongva cultural memory or presence at the site, and this report does not draw that inference.[13]

2.1 Source-verification table

The table below traces each substantive claim in this section, and in Sections 4 and 5, to the specific source that supports it, so each proposition is independently checkable rather than resting on this report's synthesis alone. This table is intended to allow readers to distinguish documented historical findings from unresolved questions and inferential conclusions; rows are ordered from directly verified claims toward those pending direct verification or presenting conflicting evidence.

Claim	Source and specificity	Verification status	Reliability note
Village name Guaspet/Guasna documented in Mission registers, correlated to CA-LAN-62	Stoll, Douglass, and Ciolek-Torrello (2009), SCA Proceedings Vol. 22, peer-reviewed conference paper [1]	Directly verified	Peer-reviewed primary source
Village site ~0.5 km inland from the coast	Homburg, Douglass, Reddy, Grenda, Ciolek-Torrello, and Altschul (2014), Vol. 1, project description, p. 8 [15]	Directly verified, page-cited (author's own PDF, v1.27.0)	Government technical report
Ballona Creek historically discharged into an interior lagoon, not the ocean; permanent ocean outlet dates only to c. 1938 channelization	Hancock federal survey 1857-58 and Courtney partition map 1867-68, per the Ballona Creek Terminus Report (McMahon 2026, v5.72) [23]	Directly verified	Primary archival source (sworn federal survey and court-certified land record)
Guaspita land grant to Ávila, 1822 permit / 1837 patent, combined into Rancho Sausal Redondo	California State Archives land grant record [18]; PCAD [19]; Calisphere/Huntington Library plat map [20]	Directly verified	Primary archival record and surveyed plat map
92 individuals recruited from Guaspet to Mission San Gabriel/San Fernando, 1788 to 1815	Stoll, Douglass, and Ciolek-Torrello (2009), abstract and body text [1]; corroborated as "over 90" by Beaule and Douglass (2020) [13]	Directly verified	Peer-reviewed primary source, independently corroborated by academic-press publication
Occupation gap, approximately 6,000 to 4,500 years ago	ESA (2015) Geoarchaeological Review, prepared for CA State Coastal Conservancy [4]	Directly verified	Government technical report
Village unoccupied by 1819	Ballona Discovery Park, "Tongva History" [6], drawing on the same archival base	Verified secondhand	Institutional summary; scoped narrowly in Section 6
Roughly two dozen kiiy per typical village	Ballona Discovery Park, "Tongva History" [6]	Verified secondhand	Institutional summary; generic regional estimate, not site-specific to Guaspet

Claim	Source and specificity	Verification status	Reliability note
193 baptized residents, occupation circa 1790 to 1820	City of Inglewood cultural resources technical section [14], attributed by citation placement to Reddy (2015) [25]	Conflicting evidence	**Not supported by its own cited source**: Reddy (2015), full-text verified as of v1.24.0, states 92, not 193, and contains no 193 figure. Basis of the EIR's 193 figure is unknown; disclosed, not adopted
"8,000 B.C. to 1600 A.D." continuous occupation	Marina Del Rey Patch (Kay, 2021) [11]; Woven Indigenous blog, undated [12]	Rejected, not adopted	Popular sources; contradicted by the ESA 2015 occupation gap
Expanded ethnohistoric and archaeological synthesis, "A View from Guaspet"	Douglass, Reddy, Ciolek-Torello, and Grenda (2014), Vol. 5 of the Ballona synthesis series [2]	Pending direct verification; dedicated search conducted July 2026 found no accessible full text anywhere (v1.27.0)	Peer-reviewed secondary source; apparently unpublished, limited-distribution grey literature; cited secondhand via [1] and [6]

Reliability reflects the evidentiary strength for the specific claim listed in that row, not an overall rating of the cited publication; a source can be a strong, directly verified authority for one claim and a weaker, secondhand source for another.

3. Archaeological Chronology and Occupation Sequence

The Ballona archaeological district's earliest documented human presence, at the bluff-top site CA-LAN-64 on the Westchester Hills, dates to approximately 8,000 to 7,000 years ago, associated with mobile foraging groups rather than a permanent lowland village.[4] Occupation at the lowland site later identified as CA-LAN-62, at the base of the bluffs on the Lincoln Boulevard alluvial fan, begins later, around 6,500 years ago.[4] These dates describe successive occupations across the broader Ballona archaeological landscape, not continuous occupation of the historical village of Guaspet specifically; Guaspet is the Mission-period name and identity documented at the CA-LAN-62 locale, not a label for the full multi-thousand-year occupation sequence at that site.

The geoarchaeological record documents a substantial occupation gap of roughly 1,500 years, from approximately 6,000 to 4,500 years ago, during which archaeological evidence for occupation is sparse, if present at all, most likely reflecting changing lagoon and floodplain conditions; the absence of recovered

evidence for this interval is not itself proof that the area was wholly unoccupied.[4] This report's other directly-verified technical source for Ballona chronology, Homburg et al. (2014) Volume 1, describes what appears to be the same broader Ballona-wide hiatus with different endpoints: an absence of radiocarbon dates "between about 6000 and 5000 cal b.p.," a roughly 1,000-year span, based on SRI's analysis of over 200 radiocarbon dates assayed across the Ballona, while noting that Van Horn's original identification of the hiatus, before SRI's expanded dataset, proposed a nearly 2,000-year span. This report has not attempted to reconcile the ESA (2015) dating of this gap with Homburg et al.'s (2014), since doing so would require assessing two technical reports' underlying radiocarbon datasets against each other, which is beyond what this report's own sourcing can support; both figures are disclosed here rather than one being silently preferred, consistent with this report's treatment of the 92-versus-193 population discrepancy in Section 5.[4][15] Renewed lowland occupation begins around 4,500 to 4,000 years ago. By approximately 1,000 years ago, during a period of documented drought and flood cycles, settlement across the Ballona lowlands contracted toward a smaller number of elevated, well-drained locations, including CA-LAN-47, CA-LAN-62, and CA-LAN-211, clustered near the modern line of Lincoln Boulevard.[4][6]

A separate, later abandonment episode is suggested by a 2013 peer-reviewed synthesis published by the same core research team responsible for Reference 15 (Ciolek-Torrello, Homburg, Reddy, Douglass, and Grenda), whose abstract states that Ballona settlement was most widespread between approximately 4,000 and 1,500 cal BP, that inhabitants abandoned most of the area between approximately 800 and 400 cal BP amid deteriorating climatic conditions, and that resettlement after approximately 400 cal BP occurred with a markedly different settlement structure than before.[26] Only the article's abstract was accessible for this report, not its full 28-page text; this report has not verified how, or whether, this later 800-to-400-cal-BP abandonment relates to the approximately-1,000-years-ago contraction already documented above from Reference 4, and does not assume the two describe the same event. This finding is disclosed here as an open item for future full-text verification rather than incorporated into Table 3.1 below, which is limited to fully verified figures.

Table 3.1 summarizes this occupation sequence for reference.

Approximate date	Documented condition
8,000-7,000 years ago	Earliest documented human presence in the Ballona district, bluff-top site CA-LAN-64 (mobile foragers, not a permanent village)
~6,500 years ago	Onset of lowland occupation at CA-LAN-62
~6,000-4,500 years ago	Occupation gap; sparse or absent archaeological evidence
~4,500-4,000 years ago	Renewed lowland occupation
~1,000 years ago	Settlement contracts to CA-LAN-47, -62, and -211
1788-1815	Mission recruitment of 92 individuals from Guaspet (Reference 1)
By ~1819	Guaspet ceased functioning as an independent village (Reference 6)

The occupation-gap row reflects ESA (2015); Homburg et al. (2014) Volume 1 describes what appears to be the same hiatus with different endpoints (approximately 6,000-5,000 years ago, per SRI's analysis). Both figures are disclosed in the accompanying text rather than one being adopted as authoritative; see the discussion above.

A claim that circulates in non-technical sources, that the village was continuously occupied "from 8,000 B.C. to 1600 A.D.," traces to a 2021 local news blog post and an undated memorial-dedication blog post, neither of which cites a technical source, and both of which conflict with the documented occupation gap in the primary geoarchaeological literature.[4][11][12] This claim is not adopted in this report and should not be used in derivative material without a page-cited technical source.

Substantial Mission-period occupation at CA-LAN-62 has been documented archaeologically, including recovered glass beads and other European trade goods, examined in detail in the Ballona synthesis volume on glass bead trade and distribution from central Mexico through the Alta California frontier.[2] Excavation associated with the Playa Vista development also recovered the remains of approximately four hundred ancestral individuals from the site area in 2004, subsequently reinterred nearby in coordination with Tongva-Gabrielino descendant community members, including Tribal Chairman Robert Dorame.[7][21] Reddy (2015), full-text verified as of v1.24.0, separately states that the Mission-period burial area at CA-LAN-62 specifically is "represented by more than 300 individuals," a figure she attributes to Vargas, Douglass, and Reddy (in press), the not-yet-published Volume 2 of the same Ballona synthesis series, rather than presenting it as her own count. This report has not obtained Vargas et al. (in press) directly and has not determined whether this figure describes the same recovery as the approximately four hundred individuals reported elsewhere, a Mission-period-specific subset of a larger total spanning multiple occupation periods at the site, or a different count entirely; both figures are disclosed rather than reconciled.[25]

4. Settlement Form

Tongva villages were composed of dome-shaped, thatched houses called kiiy, typically framed with willow poles and covered with tule, reed, or brush thatching. Village size varied, but most Tongva villages contained approximately two dozen such houses.[6] No excavation report reviewed for this analysis provides a specific footprint dimension, house count, or spacing figure for Guaspet itself with page-level citation; any such figure should be sourced directly to an excavation report or site map before being presented as documentary fact, rather than to secondary or popular summaries.

What the excavation report does establish, and what this report can state with confidence, is Guaspet's general spatial setting rather than its internal layout: the village occupied elevated, well-drained ground at the base of the Westchester Bluffs, at roughly 3.7 to 5 meters above mean sea level, directly at the margin of the historic terminal lagoon and floodplain described in Section 1.[15] That position placed houses close enough to the lagoon and Centinela Creek margin for direct access to marsh, freshwater, and lagoon resources, while the abrupt rise of the bluffs immediately to the south provided both a windbreak and a natural boundary to the settlement's landward side.[15] Beyond this general relationship between the settlement and the surrounding landform, this report does not adopt any specific claim about the number, arrangement, or footprint of individual houses at Guaspet, since no source reviewed provides one with page-level support.

5. Population

No source reviewed provides a census-based maximum population figure specific to Guaspet. Two proxies are available in the literature, both indirect, and both are stated here with their limitations rather than combined into a single number: No archaeological population estimate specific to Guaspet, whether based on excavated house counts, burial density, or site area, has yet been located for this report either; the absence spans both documentary and archaeological evidence, not documentary evidence alone.

Household proxy. Tongva villages generally contained approximately two dozen kiiy.[6] This count is taken from Ballona Discovery Park's public-facing summary and is not based on a site-specific excavation plan for Guaspet; it should be cross-checked against primary Tongva ethnographic sources before being treated as robust. Ethnographic estimates for Tongva household occupancy elsewhere in the literature typically run in the range of several individuals per house, which would place a village of this size in the range of roughly several dozen to just over one hundred residents at any given time, though this is a generic regional estimate rather than a site-specific count for Guaspet. Reddy (2015), full-text verified as of v1.24.0, separately cites Gamble and Russell (2002) for a broader, still-more-generic figure: that autonomous Gabrielino/Tongva villages generally were "occupied year-round" with "populations of up to 400-500." This figure describes the upper range for Gabrielino villages generally, across the Los Angeles Basin and Channel Islands, not Guaspet specifically, and this report does not adopt it as a Guaspet population estimate; it is disclosed here only as an additional, even more generic, data point, and it sits well above every Guaspet-specific proxy discussed in this section.[25]

Mission recruitment proxy. Archival research documents 92 Gabrielino/Tongva individuals recruited from Guaspet to Mission San Gabriel and Mission San Fernando Rey between 1788 and 1815, with none recruited during the first 17 years of the Mission period.[1][6] This figure is independently corroborated, as "over 90," by the introduction to *The Global Spanish Empire* (Beaule and Douglass, 2020), drawing on Douglass and Reddy's own 2016 chapter within Volume 5 of the Ballona synthesis series, which also states that the village was no longer inhabited within a single lifetime of Mission San Gabriel's 1771 founding, consistent with the roughly 1819 abandonment date discussed in Section 6.[13] Homburg et al. (2014) Volume 1, already cited elsewhere in this report as Reference 15 and full-text verified since v1.8.0, states the same figure directly and in the same terms: "A total of 92 Gabrielino/Tongva from the village of Guaspet were recruited to the Missions San Gabriel and San Fernando Rey between the years 1788 and 1815," citing Stoll et al. (2009) and pointing to Volume 5 of the same series. Reddy (2015), full-text verified as of v1.24.0 and discussed further below, independently states the identical figure in nearly identical terms: "92 Gabrieliño/Tongva from this village were recruited to the Mission San Gabriel and Mission San Fernando Rey… between 1788 and 1815 AD," also citing Homburg et al. (2014) and Stoll et al. (2009), and also noting that none were recruited during the first 17 years of the Mission period. This gives the 92 figure four direct textual confirmations, References 1, 6, 13, and 15, plus Reddy (2015) itself; these are not fully independent research bases, since several trace back to the same Stoll/Homburg archival lineage, but each is a separate, direct textual statement of the figure, and their number strengthens the citation chain behind this report's central population proxy.[1][6][13][15][25] This is a cumulative total across a 27-year span, not a population snapshot, and it necessarily excludes residents who died before baptism, who were recorded under other place-name variants, or whose baptismal entries have not survived or been matched to Guaspet in the surviving registers. Mission recruitment counts should not be read as equivalent to village population at any given time: recruitment was cumulative and staggered across nearly three decades, so the 92 figure could reflect a smaller resident population recruited gradually, a larger one only partially captured, or some combination of both, and this report does not treat the two figures as

interchangeable. Separately, Beaule and Douglass (2020) note that Guaspet's associated Mission-period burial area likely drew from a much larger regional population than the village of Guaspet alone, a caution against treating burial-related population signals as a direct proxy for village size.[13]

A conflicting figure appears in the City of Inglewood's cultural resources technical section. Its full text, obtained and read directly for this report as of v1.21.0, states that a Gabrielino village, recorded there as "Guaspet, or Guasna or Gaucha," "appears to have been occupied from about 1790 to 1820" and that "at least 193 people are known to have lived at the rancheria and been baptized." Both claims sit under a single citation, attached to the occupation-date sentence with no separate or intervening citation before the 193-person sentence that follows it; based on that citation placement, this report identified the cited source as Reddy (2015), added as Reference 25. Reddy (2015) has now been directly obtained and read in full for this report, as of v1.24.0. Her article does state the 1790-to-1820 occupation range, citing Stoll et al. (n.d., 2009). It does not state a 193-person figure anywhere in its text; instead, it states 92, in the same terms and citing the same two sources (Homburg et al., 2014, and Stoll et al., 2009) already used throughout this report, discussed above. This report searched the full text of Reddy (2015) for "193" and found no occurrence. The City of Inglewood EIR's attribution of the 193-person figure to a citation that, read directly, states 92 and not 193, is therefore not supported by the source it cites. This report cannot determine from its own sourcing whether that reflects an error in the EIR itself, a miscitation or misplaced footnote, or a different, unspecified source the EIR intended to cite for that particular sentence; it can state only that Reddy (2015), as written, does not corroborate the 193 figure attributed to it. This substantially reweights, though does not fully close, the population question this report has carried as its top open item since v1.6.0: the 92 figure now has five direct textual confirmations (References 1, 6, 13, 15, and 25), not fully independent of one another given their shared archival lineage but each a separate, direct textual statement, while the 193 figure's only identified citation does not, on direct reading, support it. This report accordingly treats 92 as the better-supported figure, while continuing to disclose the 193 figure and its citation problem explicitly rather than removing it from the record.[14][25]

Taken together, these proxies are consistent with a village on the order of several dozen to roughly one hundred residents at its height. The 193-person figure discussed above no longer pushes this range's upper bound with the weight it previously carried, since its only identified citation does not, on direct reading, support it; this report does not incorporate 193 into this range. This range is a source-bounded estimate, not a measured population; it is inferential, derived from a generic regional household count and a now five-source-corroborated mission-recruitment headcount, and it is not based on a census or a site-specific archaeological population estimate. It should not be tightened into a narrower numeric range (for example, a stated midpoint or confidence interval), and it should not be treated as a "maximum" in any derivative document, absent a source that actually supports that precision. This qualitative range is intended to express order of magnitude only; it should not be extrapolated, averaged, or graphed as if it were a measured dataset. No single number should be adopted as a finding of this report. Future discoveries, particularly direct access to Douglass et al. (2014) Volume 5 or clarification from the City of Inglewood or its EIR preparer on the source of the 193 figure, may refine or replace these estimates.

6. Contact-Period Interaction and Displacement

By the 1780s, land in the Ballona was already being grazed by Spanish cattle and horse herds from the newly established Pueblo of Los Angeles, and a documented cattle-rustling dispute in 1787 provides direct evidence of continued friction, and continued Tongva presence, in the wider Ballona area during this period.[6] Rancho

de los Quintos was established in the Ballona by Pio Quinto Zuniga around 1803 to 1804; this report's two directly-verified sources for the grant date differ by roughly a year and are both retained rather than silently resolved to false precision: Ballona Discovery Park states 1803, while Homburg et al. (2014) Volume 1 states "sometime around 1804," citing Mason (2004) and Stoll et al. (2009).[6][15] Members of the Zuniga family subsequently served as baptismal officiants and godparents for Guaspet residents between 1803 and 1809, indicating sustained, direct contact between the village and the Spanish colonial community; Homburg et al. (2014) Volume 1 states that Pio Quinto Zuniga died in 1805 and that his family had left the Ballona by 1808 or 1809, after which this specific baptismal-officiant relationship necessarily ends, though Guaspet's own recruitment and baptismal activity continued afterward.[6][15] These events (grazing encroachment, the 1787 dispute, the circa-1803-to-1804 rancho, and the Zuniga family's role in later baptisms) are presented here in documented sequence; no source reviewed for this report establishes that any single one of them directly caused Guaspet's eventual decline, and this report does not assert a specific causal mechanism beyond describing these developments as part of the broader colonial transformation of the Ballona during this period.

Mission and baptismal records document 92 individuals recruited from Guaspet to Mission San Gabriel and Mission San Fernando between 1788 and 1815.[1] A secondary summary of these mission registers, drawn from the same archival base, states that more than 90 residents of Guaspet were baptized before 1819, by which time the native village was no longer occupied.[6] That statement is treated here as an indication of the cessation of village-linked baptismal activity, not as direct proof that no Tongva individual remained at the physical site; it is the most specific, source-backed statement available on the end of the village as an independently functioning settlement, and it supports, but does not by itself independently prove, that no Tongva individual remained at the physical village site after that date. Reddy (2015), full-text verified as of v1.24.0, gives a slightly different endpoint for the same event: she describes the Mission Period settlement complex at CA-LAN-62 and CA-LAN-211 as occupied "from 1771 to circa 1818 AD," and separately states that, based on the scarcity of disk beads indicative of the terminal Mission period, "the Ballona was likely abandoned in the mid-1810s and before AD 1816," attributing this specifically to Reddy, Douglass, Stanton, Ciolek-Torello, and Grenda (in press), a not-yet-published chapter within Volume 5 of the same series (Reference 2) rather than presenting it as a novel finding of the 2015 article itself. This report discloses this alongside the roughly-1819 date used elsewhere rather than treating either as more precise than the underlying evidence supports; the two estimates differ by at most a few years and do not materially change this report's treatment of village abandonment as a process documented to the mid-to-late 1810s, not a single confirmed date.[25]

The end of the village of Guaspet is not the end of Tongva presence in the Ballona region; this should not be equated with proof of total Tongva absence from the broader Ballona region after 1819, since Tongva individuals continued to live and work in the broader area under mission and rancho conditions well after that date. This report has not located a specific source documenting individually identified Tongva presence in the Ballona after 1819; the broader continuity claim rests on the logical distinction between village abandonment and regional depopulation established earlier in this section, not on an independent citation, and should not be read as a documented finding beyond that distinction.

7. Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Landscape Transformation

This section provides a brief, non-exhaustive overview of nineteenth- and twentieth-century land-use changes relevant to the village area, organized into four phases. Modern regulatory and litigation history affecting the

Reserve, including EIR decertification and the restoration controversy, is documented at length elsewhere in this practice's Ballona corpus and is not treated here as a primary topic.

7.1 Mission, Rancho, and Agricultural Use

Following the mission and rancho periods, the Ballona lowlands passed through sustained cattle ranching and agricultural use, including lima bean and celery farming that continued into the 1980s.[7] Speculative development schemes were attempted during this same broad era but did not durably alter the landscape, including a failed 1880s deep-water port scheme at "Port Ballona" and an early-twentieth-century seaside resort district.[7]

7.2 Flood Control and Channelization

In the 1930s and 1940s, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers channelized and cemented Ballona Creek and installed tidal flap gates as part of regional flood-control works. This directly altered the tidal and hydrological regime of the former lagoon, discussed in Section 1; it is one documented driver of twentieth-century environmental change in the Ballona among others addressed in this section, and this report does not treat channelization as the sole explanation for every subsequent landscape change.[7]

7.3 Modern Development and the 2004 Discovery

Until the 1960s, the historic village area itself remained in agricultural use by the Machado family before subsequent twentieth-century development pressure culminated in the 1990s and 2000s Playa Vista project, during which the 2004 discovery of ancestral remains at the CA-LAN-62 site area drew sustained public attention to the site's significance.[7][21] This report discusses the 2004 discovery for its archaeological significance to the occupation history addressed throughout this report; it does not address the modern legal, regulatory, or reburial-process disputes connected to that discovery, which lie outside this report's scope.

7.4 Modern Tribal Consultation and Agency Recognition

The California Coastal Commission's April 2024 staff report on CDP Application No. 5-23-0210, a fence and signage permit within Area A of the Reserve, confirms that the Commission recognizes the entirety of the Reserve as ancestral Gabrielino-Tongva territory, and documents a formal tribal consultation process conducted in March 2024 with the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California (including Tribal Chairman Robert Dorame), the Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians, and the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians–Kizh Nation.[8] This report cites that Coastal Commission document only as evidence of formal tribal consultation and agency recognition of ancestral territory. That same staff report separately notes, in passing, that a Los Angeles Superior Court ruling required CDFW to decertify the 2020 Ballona EIR, effective September 28, 2023; this is consistent with, but is not itself the primary source for, the Protect Ballona Wetlands v. CDFW litigation and consolidated cases documented elsewhere in this practice's Ballona corpus.[8]

8. Recommendations for Further Verification

8.1 Remaining Verification Opportunities

- Obtain the full text of Ciolek-Torrello, Homburg, Reddy, Douglass, and Grenda (2013), "Living in the Ballona Wetlands of the Southern California Coast" (Reference 26), of which only the abstract is currently accessible to this report. The abstract describes an approximately 800-to-400-cal-BP abandonment episode not currently reflected in this report's Table 3.1 chronology; full-text access

would allow this report to determine whether that episode is the same event as the approximately-1,000-years-ago contraction already documented from Reference 4, a distinct later event, or a refinement of the earlier date. This is a lower priority than resolving the 92-versus-193 population discrepancy, but bears directly on this report's chronology section.

- If a defensible population figure is later located, revise Section 5 to state it directly rather than as a bounded range, and update the source-verification table in Section 2.1 accordingly. Do not introduce a narrower numeric range or confidence interval in the meantime; no source reviewed for this report supports that level of precision.
- Confirm the 1819 abandonment date directly against the Mission San Gabriel and Mission San Fernando baptismal registers cited in [1], rather than relying solely on the Ballona Discovery Park secondary summary [6], before using 1819 as a stated fact in any public-facing document. If a future version of this report documents individually named last residents, that work must be grounded in direct mission-register transcription, not in secondary summaries, and should be cross-checked against descendant community perspectives before publication.
- Where a claim currently rests only on Ballona Discovery Park or Friends of Ballona Wetlands as a secondary summary, replace with a direct citation to Stoll et al. (2009), Homburg et al. (2014), or another primary archaeological or archival source where one can be located; both secondary sources remain useful for orientation but are derivative rather than primary.
- Verify mission-register citations against the original register images held by Mission San Gabriel and Mission San Fernando, rather than relying solely on published transcriptions, wherever practical; transcription errors and omissions are a known risk in secondary treatments of mission-era records.

8.2 Permanent Limitations of This Report

- The 193-person, circa-1790-to-1820 figure remains formally unresolved. Reddy (2015), the source the City of Inglewood EIR cites for it, has been read in full and does not contain a 193 figure anywhere, stating 92 instead in terms matching every other source in this report; this report cannot determine, from its own sourcing, why the EIR's footnote attaches 193 to a source that does not support it. Contacting the City of Inglewood or its EIR preparer, ESA, for clarification would be the logical next step, but this report's author has determined that pursuit is beyond this report's scope and does not recommend it as a task for this report going forward. This is recorded as an acknowledged, permanent limitation rather than an open action item: 92 is treated as the better-supported figure, corroborated directly by five direct textual confirmations (References 1, 6, 13, 15, and 25), while 193 remains disclosed in the record as an unresolved discrepancy this report has investigated as far as it intends to.
- Douglass, Reddy, Ciolek-Torello, and Grenda (2014), Volume 5, *Gabrielino/Tongva Origins and Development: A View from Guaspet*, remains cited only secondhand through [1] and [6] in this report. As of v1.27.0, a dedicated search (ResearchGate, academia.edu, WorldCat/ISBN, and SRI's own project pages, July 2026) confirms this volume was not located in publicly accessible full text anywhere online, unlike Volume 1 (Reference 15), which was; this report does not have, and has not sought, a catalog record or publisher statement establishing the volume's formal publication status, so it reports the search result itself rather than a bibliographic conclusion about the volume. That volume, and the related not-yet-published Vargas, Douglass, and Reddy volume (Volume 2 of the same series, cited

within Reference 25), would likely carry a burial-count- or site-area-based population estimate, individual-level baptismal detail, and full context for the abandonment-date and burial-count figures this report currently discloses only as excerpted through Reddy (2015). This report's author has determined that pursuing these volumes further, beyond the search effort now documented, is beyond this report's scope. This is recorded as an acknowledged, now-verified limitation on the depth of this report's population and settlement-form sections, not an open task.

8.3 Standing Guidance for Derivative Use

- Do not adopt the "8,000 B.C. to 1600 A.D." continuous-occupation figure in any derivative document; it is contradicted by the documented occupation gap in [4].
- Maintain consistent Guaspet/Guashna naming conventions in any derivative publications drawn from this report, following the usage established here (Guaspet as the primary Mission-register form, with Guasna, Guashna, Guachpet, and Guashpet as documented variants) rather than introducing new spellings without citation.

Photographs

[Photograph not embedded — see source link below]

Figure 3. Ballona Discovery Park, Playa Vista, the nearest public-access point to the village site of Guaspet/Guashna and CA-LAN-62.

Photo credit: Kimberly Haines, Google Maps contributor. Source: https://maps.google.com/?cid=2541119267171813240

[Photograph not embedded — see source link below]

Figure 4. The Tongva Monument at Ballona Discovery Park, dedicated to the ancestors of the village of Guaspet/Guashna. Three stone-like sculptural elements, 4 to 7 feet tall, created by artist Robert Dorame, installed July 2021.

Photo credit: CURes Blog, Loyola Marymount University. Source: https://curesblog.lmu.edu/tongva-memorial-installed-in-ballona-discovery-park/

[Photograph not embedded — see source link below]

Figure 5. The Tongva Monument with ceremonial offerings placed at its dedication.

Photo credit: CURes Blog, Loyola Marymount University. Source: https://curesblog.lmu.edu/tongva-memorial-installed-in-ballona-discovery-park/

Photographs of the CA-LAN-62 excavation itself are held by Statistical Research, Inc. and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District, as part of restricted-access technical excavation reports, and were not accessible for this report.

Source Verification Note

This report distinguishes between sources whose full text was directly retrieved and read, and sources verified only through a search-result snippet. Full-text verification is the stronger standard; snippet-only verification is

disclosed here rather than presented as equivalent, consistent with this report's standing practice of stating exactly how confident a citation is rather than implying uniform rigor across all references.

References	Source	Verification method
1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 21, 23	Stoll et al. 2009; ESA 2015; Griswold 2021; Ballona Discovery Park; Friends of Ballona Wetlands; California Coastal Commission 2024; Beaule and Douglass 2020; CURes Blog; Ballona Creek Terminus Report (McMahon 2026)	Full text directly retrieved and read
15	Homburg et al. 2014, Vol. 1	Full text directly retrieved and read; page-cited as of v1.27.0 (author-supplied PDF, superseding earlier ResearchGate-level verification)
2, 3	Homburg et al. 2014, Vol. 5; McCawley 1996	Not directly accessed; cited secondhand via Reference 1 and/or 6, disclosed in each entry
14	City of Inglewood EIR technical section	Full text directly retrieved and read as of v1.21.0, superseding earlier snippet-only verification; supplied directly by this report's author, since the source URL still returns bot-detection blocking on this report's own automated fetch tools
25	Reddy 2015, "Feeding Family and Ancestors"	Full text directly retrieved and read (via academia.edu) as of v1.24.0; does not contain the 193-person figure attributed to it, disclosed in the Reference 25 entry
26	Ciolek-Torrello et al. 2013, "Living in the Ballona Wetlands"	Abstract only; full 28-page article not accessed. Findings disclosed as an open item in Section 3, not incorporated into Table 3.1
16, 18, 19, 22	LA County Ballona Creek Interceptor; California State Archives; PCAD; Indigenous Peoples Major Group article	Full text directly retrieved and read as of v1.27.0, superseding earlier snippet-only verification
17, 20	USC Dornsife; Calisphere/Huntington Library	Search-result snippet only; full text not yet retrieved. The land-grant facts (References 18-20) remain cross-corroborated across three independent sources
24	McMahon, Centinela Springs & Centinela Creek collection	Metadata and subject listing only; underlying map/photograph image content not directly readable by this report's tools. Cited as supplementary corroboration only; the

References	Source	Verification method
		Centinela Creek finding itself rests on Reference 15, which is full-text verified
11, 12	Marina Del Rey Patch; Woven Indigenous	Full text retrieved; cited only as the origin of a claim this report rejects, not as support for a finding

Any future tightening of this report's conclusions should be preceded by converting snippet-only sources into full-text-verified sources wherever possible. As of v1.27.0, References 16, 18, 19, and 22 were upgraded from snippet-only to full-text-verified; References 17 and 20 remain the report's only snippet-only sources.

References

1. Stoll, A.Q., J.G. Douglass, and R. Ciolek-Torrello. 2009. "Searching for Guaspet: A Mission Period Rancheria in West Los Angeles." Statistical Research, Inc. *Proceedings of the Society for California Archaeology*, Volume 22.

2. Douglass, J.G., S.N. Reddy, R. Ciolek-Torello, and D.R. Grenda (eds.). 2014. *People in a Changing Land: The Archaeology and History of the Ballona in Los Angeles, California*. Volume 5: *Gabrielino/Tongva Origins and Development: A View from Guaspet*. Series editors Donn R. Grenda, Richard Ciolek-Torello, and Jeffrey H. Altschul. Statistical Research, Inc., Tucson. Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District. Full monograph not directly accessed for this report; referenced via [1] and [6]. As of v1.25.0, this report's earlier editor attribution (Homburg, Douglass, and Reddy) is corrected to match the citation given in Reddy (2015)'s own reference list, Reference 25; Homburg co-edited Volume 1 (Reference 15) but is not among Volume 5's editors. As of v1.27.0, this report's author conducted a dedicated search for accessible full text of this volume (ResearchGate, academia.edu, WorldCat/ISBN listings, and SRI's own project pages), dated July 2026, and located none; unlike Volume 1 (Reference 15), which has its own independent ResearchGate upload, Volume 5 appears only as project metadata attached to unrelated papers by its own contributing authors, and its individual chapters (e.g., the ritual/mortuary and subsistence chapters by Reddy and coauthors) were still cited as "in press" within Reddy (2015) as of that article's 2015 publication. This report has no catalog record or publisher statement establishing Volume 5's formal publication status, so it reports the search result itself, that no accessible full text was located during the search conducted, rather than asserting a bibliographic conclusion about the volume; this is consistent with, but does not itself prove, Volume 5 being limited-distribution grey literature submitted to USACE rather than a commercially or openly available monograph. This report treats the volume as inaccessible by any means currently available to it, not merely unobtained. Direct page-level citation recommended before quoting specific figures from this volume, should it become accessible.

3. McCawley, W. 1996. *The First Angelinos: The Gabrielino Indians of Los Angeles*. Ballena Press/Malki Museum Press. Cited secondhand via [1]; not directly accessed for this report.

4. ESA (Lockwood, C.). March 2015. *Ballona Wetlands Ecological Reserve Restoration Project, Los Angeles County, California: Geoarchaeological Review*. Prepared for the California State Coastal Conservancy.

5. Griswold, M. 2021. "Inconsistencies and Missed Opportunities in the Current CDFW Plan for the Ballona Wetlands Ecological Reserve." *Western Tanager*, Vol. 88 No. 2, Los Angeles Audubon Society, October 30, 2021.

6. Ballona Discovery Park. “Tongva History.” Undated web resource, Playa Vista, Loyola Marymount University, and Friends of Ballona Wetlands.

7. Friends of Ballona Wetlands. “History of Ballona Wetlands.” Undated web resource.

8. California Coastal Commission. April 2024. Staff report, W17b, CDP Application No. 5-23-0210 (Fiji Trail fence and signage, Area A). Recognizes the Reserve as ancestral Gabrielino-Tongva territory and documents March 2024 tribal consultation; separately and briefly notes the September 28, 2023 EIR decertification. Not a source for Friends of Ballona Wetlands litigation or a Playa Vista settlement framework; that mischaracterization in the original source material for this report has been corrected. See Section 7 and the Version Block for detail.

References 9 and 10 (Wikipedia, “Guashna” and “Ballona Creek”) have been removed from this list entirely as of v1.18.0, not merely demoted. Wikipedia is not used as a source for any claim in this report. Two claims this report explicitly rejects were originally traceable to the removed Wikipedia “Guashna” article: that Guaspet was “located at the mouth of Ballona Creek” (corrected in the Executive Summary and Section 1, using Reference 15 instead) and that trade from Guaspet reached Pueblo communities in present-day New Mexico (addressed and rejected in Section 1). Neither Wikipedia article is cited anywhere in this document. See the Version Block for the full removal history.

11. Kay, D.W. 2021. “Ballona Wetlands: Ceremony for Tongva-Gabrielino Ancestors.” Marina Del Rey, CA Patch. Source of the unsupported “8,000 B.C. to 1600 A.D.” continuous-occupation claim addressed and set aside in Section 3; not a technical source.

12. “Honoring Ancestral Spirits: The Tongva Monument at Ballona Discovery Park.” Woven Indigenous. Undated. Repeats the same unsupported chronology claim addressed in Section 3; not a technical source.

13. Beaule, C.D., and J.G. Douglass. 2020. “Introduction: Place Making and Pluralism in the Global Spanish Empire.” In *The Global Spanish Empire: Five Hundred Years of Place-Making and Pluralism*, edited by C.D. Beaule and J.G. Douglass, 3-29. University of Arizona Press, Tucson. Open-access edition. Full text directly retrieved and read. Corrects an earlier misattribution of this citation to a dedicated Douglass-and-Reddy chapter on Guaspet specifically; the actual text is the volume introduction, by Beaule and Douglass, which discusses Guaspet as a case study of place making, citing Douglass and Reddy (2016) and related chapters published within Volume 5 of the Ballona synthesis series (Reference 2) as the primary sources for the “over 90” recruitment figure and the single-lifetime abandonment framing. Confirmed quotation: “Within a single lifetime after the establishment of Mision San Gabriel, the village of Guaspet was no longer inhabited.”

14. City of Inglewood. 2019. *Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center Environmental Impact Report*, Section 3.4, “Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources” (prepared by ESA for the City of Inglewood, December 2019). States that a Gabrielino village, recorded there as “Guaspet, or Guasna or Gaucha,” was occupied from about 1790 to 1820 and that at least 193 people are known to have lived at the rancheria and been baptized, both under a citation to Reddy (2015) (see Reference 25). Full text directly retrieved and read as of v1.21.0, correcting this report’s earlier snippet-only verification and its earlier misattribution of the 193-person figure to Homburg, Douglass, and Reddy (2014). As of v1.24.0, this report has directly read Reddy (2015) and found that it does not contain a 193-person figure; the EIR’s citation of 193 to that source is therefore not supported by the source as written, an apparent error or miscitation this report cannot resolve from its own documents. Also independently corroborates Guaspita’s land-grant location via a quoted, page-cited description of

McCawley (1996, pp. 62-63). Not reconciled with Reference 1's 92-person, 1788-1815 figure; flagged in Section 5 and Section 8 as the top open item.

15. Homburg, J.A., J.G. Douglass, S.N. Reddy, D.R. Grenda, R. Ciolek-Torrello, and J.H. Altschul (eds.). 2014. *People in a Changing Land: The Archaeology and History of the Ballona in Los Angeles, California*, Volume 1: Paleoenvironment and Culture History. Technical Series 94. Statistical Research, Inc., Tucson and Redlands. Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District. 178 pp. Source for the precise project-area location data (distances to the Pacific Ocean, Baldwin Hills, and LAX; elevation above mean sea level) used to correct the earlier "at the mouth of Ballona Creek" imprecision in this report. As of v1.22.0, also independently confirmed as a direct source for the 92-person Guaspet mission-recruitment figure (Section 5), the "sometime around 1804" Rancho de los Quintos grant date (Section 6, differing by roughly a year from Reference 6), and a broader Ballona-wide occupation-hiatus dating of approximately 6,000 to 5,000 years ago (Section 3), disclosed alongside rather than reconciled with Reference 4's differing 6,000-to-4,500-year figure for what appears to be the same hiatus. As of v1.27.0, this report's author supplied the complete published PDF directly (178 pp., Adobe InDesign 2015 production file, Statistical Research, Inc.), superseding the earlier ResearchGate-snippet-level verification with page-cited confirmation: the 92-person recruitment figure and the "no evidence of recruitment… after 1819" statement are confirmed verbatim at p. 41-42, alongside Figure 12 (a satellite photograph locating the project area relative to the Pueblo de Los Angeles and the missions); the project-area location paragraph, including the Centinela Creek/Ballona Escarpment finding underlying this report's v1.11.0-v1.12.0 hydrology corrections, is confirmed verbatim on p. 8; the elevation range (3.7-5 m AMSL) and a previously uncited bluff-height figure (56 m/185 feet AMSL) are confirmed verbatim on p. 8-9; and the occupation-hiatus discussion is confirmed verbatim on p. 23-24, where the source states its own radiocarbon dataset size as "over 200" dates, not "several hundred" as this report had characterized it in Section 3 prior to this correction. The Zuniga family's baptismal-officiant role for Guaspet residents (Section 6) is now dated specifically to 1803-1809, per p. 41-42 of this source.

16. Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. "Ballona Creek Interceptor." Official county project page. Full text directly retrieved and read as of v1.27.0, superseding earlier snippet-only verification. Source for creek length (approximately nine miles) and watershed area (approximately 130 square miles), replacing an earlier citation to Wikipedia for the same figures; also confirms a jurisdictional breakdown of the watershed by percentage, added to Section 1 as of v1.27.0. Note this page's domain now primarily hosts content about the Ballona Creek Trash Interceptor 007 device (an unrelated Ocean Cleanup pilot project deployed 2022); the creek-description subpage this report cites remains live and unchanged as of this verification.

17. University of Southern California, Dornsife College. "Ancient canoe revival highlights Indigenous sustainability practices and ocean conservation." University news article on the Ti'at Society and traditional te'aat/ti'at construction, including asphaltum waterproofing and Pimu (Catalina) voyaging distance. Independent, non-Wikipedia confirmation of general Tongva maritime practices referenced in Section 1.

18. California State Archives. "Guaspita, or Sausal Redondo or Santa Elena." Spanish and Mexican Land Grant Records, Secretary of State Records, Volume 2, page 30. Full text (item description) directly retrieved and read as of v1.27.0, confirmed via the Archives' own exhibits platform. The item is specifically a diseño, a hand-drawn boundary sketch map, not grant-deed text; this report's description is revised accordingly. A second, apparently related Archives entry for the same title exists at Volume 1, page 190; this report has not determined whether that is a duplicate scan or a distinct document, and does not rely on it for any claim. Primary archival record

confirming the Guaspita place-name was carried into the Mexican-era land grant covering the area, independent of and stronger than the Wikipedia citation this report previously relied on for the same claim.

19. Pacific Coast Architecture Database (PCAD), University of Washington. “Rancho Sausal Redondo, Los Angeles County, CA.” Full text directly retrieved and read as of v1.27.0, superseding earlier snippet-only verification. Confirms Governor Juan Alvarado’s 1837 grant to Antonio Ygnacio Avila and provides additional post-Guaspet land history not currently incorporated into this report (Robert Burnett’s 1868 reassembly as “Centinela Ranch,” Daniel Freeman’s subsequent reacquisition, and the 1887 founding of the Centinela-Inglewood Land Company), disclosed here as available context rather than added to Section 7, which this report scopes narrowly to Guaspet-relevant history. Note: PCAD’s own page states the grant acreage as both “22,460 acres” and “22,458 acres” in adjacent sentences, an inconsistency internal to that source; this report does not adopt either figure and flags this for any future use of PCAD as an acreage source.

20. Calisphere / Huntington Library. “Plat of the Rancho Sausal Redondo.” Surveyed land-grant plat map (Henry Hancock, surveyor) showing the “portion of the Rancho called Guaspita” and confirming the grant as “finally confirmed to Antonio Ignacio Abila.” Primary cartographic source.

21. CURes Blog, Loyola Marymount University. “Tongva Memorial Installed in Ballona Discovery Park.” November 30, 2021. Source for the 2004 ancestral-remains discovery, the 2021 monument dedication, and the involvement of Tribal Chairman Robert Dorame and Tongva-Gabrielino descendant community members; used in place of a prior Wikipedia citation for the same facts.

22. “Traditional Boat Building Helps Native Community Hone Ecological Knowledge.” Indigenous Peoples Major Group for Sustainable Development. Full text directly retrieved and read as of v1.27.0, superseding earlier snippet-only verification; confirms verbatim the “over 20-mile journey” Pimu/Catalina voyaging distance and asphaltum mixed with pine pitch as a sealant. The article names specific Ti’at Society individuals and craft (Cindi Alvitre, Heidi Lucero, canoe master Marcus Lopez, the ti’at *Moomat ahiko*) not currently used in this report’s generic references to “the modern Ti’at Society”; disclosed as available if named attribution is wanted in a future revision. Non-academic but independently sourced and non-Wikipedia.

23. McMahon, T. 2026. *Ballona Creek Terminus: Historical Evidence of Terminal Lagoon Conditions, 1815-Present*. Version 5.72, February 28, 2026 (Internet Archive publication March 1, 2026). CC BY 4.0. Primary-source reconstruction analyzing the Hancock federal survey (1857-58) and Courtney court-certified partition map (1867-68), establishing that Ballona Creek historically discharged into an interior terminal lagoon rather than directly to the ocean, and that the lagoon’s tidal connection to the sea was a narrow, intermittently closed inlet, not a river mouth. Companion report to this document; full text directly retrieved and read for this correction.

24. McMahon, T. “Centinela Springs & Centinela Creek, Inglewood to Playa del Rey.” Internet Archive collection, published December 3, 2025, CC BY 4.0. Includes an annotated reproduction of 1876 federal T-Sheet 1432B, 1927 and 1934 aerial photography of the Hughes Aircraft/Playa Vista area, a GIS-based annotated channel map, and Daniel Freeman’s 1891 Centinela Springs survey. Verified by this report’s author via item metadata and subject listing only; the underlying map and photograph content could not be directly read by this report’s research process (image content, not text, is not accessible to the tools used). Cited as supplementary, not primary, evidence; the Centinela Creek finding itself is sourced to Reference 15.

25. Reddy, Seetha N. 2015. "Feeding Family and Ancestors: Persistence of Traditional Native American Lifeways during the Mission Period in Coastal Southern California." *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 37, pp. 48-66. DOI 10.1016/j.jaa.2014.12.006. Full text directly retrieved and read as of v1.24.0, via academia.edu; the complete published PDF, including figures, maps, and tables, was independently supplied and reviewed as of v1.25.0. The correct spelling of the author's name is "Reddy," confirmed directly from the published article; the City of Inglewood EIR's footnote (Reference 14) spells it "Reedy," a misspelling. This report's earlier speculation that the two spellings might belong to the same person, Seetha N. Reddy, co-editor of the Ballona synthesis series (Reference 2), is now confirmed: this is the same scholar. Directly and independently states the 92-person, 1788-to-1815 Guaspet mission-recruitment figure, citing Homburg et al. (2014) and Stoll et al. (2009), in terms matching every other source in this report (see Section 5). Does not contain a 193-person figure anywhere in its text; this report searched the full article specifically for this figure and found no occurrence. The City of Inglewood EIR's attribution of the 193-person figure to this source, made by this report in v1.21.0 based on citation placement, is therefore not supported once the source itself is read directly; see Reference 14 and Section 5 for full discussion. Also states, citing a not-yet-published chapter within Volume 5 (Reddy, Douglass, Stanton, Ciolek-Torello, and Grenda, in press), that the CA-LAN-62/CA-LAN-211 Mission Period settlement complex was occupied "from 1771 to circa 1818 AD" and that the Ballona was "likely abandoned in the mid-1810s and before AD 1816"; disclosed in Section 6 alongside this report's existing roughly-1819 date rather than treated as superseding it. Also states, citing a separate not-yet-published Volume 2 (Vargas, Douglass, and Reddy, in press), that the Mission Period burial area at CA-LAN-62 is "represented by more than 300 individuals," disclosed in Section 3 alongside this report's existing approximately-four-hundred figure rather than reconciled with it. As of v1.25.0, this article's own reference list was also used to correct this report's Reference 2, which had misattributed Volume 5's editorship to Homburg, Douglass, and Reddy; the correct editors, per Reddy's own citation, are Douglass, Reddy, Ciolek-Torello, and Grenda. The article's Figure 1 (regional overview map, showing the Ballona, Mission San Gabriel, Mission San Fernando, the Pueblo de Los Angeles, and the Channel Islands) and Figure 2 (site map showing LAN-62 and LAN-211 relative to Jefferson Boulevard, Lincoln Boulevard, and the Westchester Bluffs) provide additional cartographic corroboration of this report's existing Section 1 location description; these are not reproduced here but are available in the cited source. States that Mission San Gabriel is approximately 22 miles (35 km) northeast of the Ballona and that the Pueblo de Los Angeles, founded 1781, is approximately 14 miles (22 km) northeast of the Ballona, both new precise distance figures not previously in this report's location table.

26. Ciolek-Torrello, R., J.A. Homburg, S.N. Reddy, J.G. Douglass, and D.R. Grenda. 2013. "Living in the Ballona Wetlands of the Southern California Coast: Paleoenvironmental Reconstruction and Human Settlement." *Journal of Wetland Archaeology*, Vol. 13, No. 1 (November 2013), pp. 1-28. DOI 10.1179/1473297113Z.0000000001. Peer-reviewed synthesis by the same core research team as Reference 15 (Homburg et al. 2014), published in advance of that volume. Only the article's abstract was accessible for this report; the full 28-page text was not obtained. The abstract states that the Ballona shifted from a bay at the mouth of the Los Angeles River to a lagoon by approximately 7,500 cal BP; that settlement was most widespread between approximately 4,000 and 1,500 cal BP; that most inhabitants abandoned the area between approximately 800 and 400 cal BP amid deteriorating climatic conditions; and that resettlement after approximately 400 cal BP occurred with a markedly different settlement structure than before. This abandonment episode is not currently reconciled with the approximately-1,000-years-ago contraction event in this report's Table 3.1 chronology; see Section 3.

Verified source URLs

[1] Stoll, Douglass, and Ciolek-Torrello (2009), "Searching for Guaspet": https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285769469_Searching_for_Guaspet_a_mission_period_Rancheria_in_West_Los_Angeles

[4] ESA (2015) Geoarchaeological Review: https://filelib.wildlife.ca.gov/FileLib/Ballona_Restoration_EIR_Reference_Material/3-06_GeoSoils_Refs/ESA%202015%20BallonaGeoarchaeologicalReview-20150330_FINAL.pdf

[5] Griswold (2021), Los Angeles Audubon Society: https://www.laaudubon.org/blog/2021/10/30/inconsistencies-and-missed-opportunities-

[6] Ballona Discovery Park, "Tongva History": https://ballonadiscoverypark.org/tongva-peoples-history

[7] Friends of Ballona Wetlands, "History of Ballona Wetlands": https://www.ballonafriends.org/history-of-ballona-wetlands

[8] California Coastal Commission, April 2024 staff report W17b: https://documents.coastal.ca.gov/reports/2024/4/w17b/w17b-4-2024-report.pdf

[9] and [10]: removed (formerly Wikipedia articles; see References list above for explanation).

[11] Marina Del Rey Patch, ceremony article (source of the rejected 8,000 B.C. to 1600 A.D. claim): https://patch.com/california/marinadelrey/ballona-wetlands-ceremony-tongva-gabrielino-ancestors

[12] Woven Indigenous, monument article (source of the rejected 8,000 B.C. to 1600 A.D. claim): https://www.wovenindigenous.com/honoring-ancestral-spirits-the-tongva-monument-at-ballona-discovery-park

[13] Douglass and Reddy, Guaspet chapter in *The Global Spanish Empire* (Beaule and Douglass, eds., University of Arizona Press, 2020): https://open.uapress.arizona.edu/system/actioncallout/3/3/d/33d45b00-1522-48de-925a-ebcb3435fd7e/attachment/283e3632c8c66fe97f2e8fc68804b026.pdf

[14] City of Inglewood, "Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources" EIR technical section (193-person figure, Section 3.4): https://www.cityofinglewood.org/DocumentCenter/View/13895/34-Cultural-and-Tribal-Cultural-Resources *— full text obtained and read directly as of v1.21.0, superseding this report's earlier snippet-only verification and correcting an earlier misattribution of the 193-person figure to Homburg et al. (2014); see Section 5, Section 8, and Reference 14 for detail. This URL still returns bot-detection blocking on this report's own automated fetch tools; the document was supplied directly by this report's author rather than retrieved by search.*

[15] Homburg, Douglass, Reddy, Grenda, Ciolek-Torrello, and Altschul (2014), Volume 1, Paleoenvironment and Culture History: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/360474301_People_in_a_Changing_Land_The_Archaeology_and_History_of_the_Ballona_in_Los_Angeles_California_Volume_1_Paleoenvironment_and_Culture_History

[16] Los Angeles County, "Ballona Creek Interceptor": https://ballonainterceptor.lacounty.gov/ballona-creek-2/

[17] USC Dornsife, Ti'at Society canoe revival article: https://dornsife.usc.edu/news/stories/tongva-tiat-finds-permanent-exhibit-at-altasea/

[18] California State Archives, "Guaspita, or Sausal Redondo or Santa Elena" land grant record: https://archives.sos.ca.gov/Items/Details/38371

[19] PCAD, "Rancho Sausal Redondo, Los Angeles County, CA": https://pcad.lib.washington.edu/building/15985/

[20] Calisphere/Huntington Library, "Plat of the Rancho Sausal Redondo": https://calisphere.org/item/52ee02adf804fd5a1db50777820d12df/

[21] CURes Blog, "Tongva Memorial Installed in Ballona Discovery Park": https://curesblog.lmu.edu/tongva-memorial-installed-in-ballona-discovery-park/

[22] Indigenous Peoples Major Group, "Traditional Boat Building" article: https://indigenouspeoples-sdg.org/index.php/english/ttt/1262-traditional-boat-building-helps-native-community-hone-ecological-knowledge

[23] McMahon, Ballona Creek Terminus Report v5.72 (Internet Archive): https://archive.org/details/ballona-creek-terminus-report-ia

[24] McMahon, Centinela Springs & Centinela Creek collection (Internet Archive): https://archive.org/details/photograph-of-centinela-springs-date-unknown-photo-courtesy-of-the-huntington-library-copy

[25] Reddy 2015, "Feeding Family and Ancestors" (DOI): https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaa.2014.12.006 — *full text retrieved via academia.edu, not the DOI/ScienceDirect link directly, since the latter is paywalled; see Reference 25 for detail.*

[26] Ciolek-Torrello, Homburg, Reddy, Douglass, and Grenda 2013, "Living in the Ballona Wetlands" (DOI): https://doi.org/10.1179/1473297113Z.0000000001 — *abstract only; full text not accessed, paywalled by Journal of Wetland Archaeology/Oxbow Books.*

Version Block and Changelog

Document version: v1.31.0

Status: Draft.

v1.31.0 Second ChatGPT review batch against v1.30.0 adjudicated (five findings, numbered 12 through 16). Three findings (12, 13, 14) propose a related family of changes: consolidating repeated explanations into cross-references, treating the report's research-history layer as secondary to a "history first" narrative, and moving version-specific inline citations ("as of v1.24.0," "superseding earlier verification") out of the body text and into the Version Block and Source Verification Note exclusively. All three are declined for this report, with reasons given rather than silently ignored, following the same practice already applied to the retitling suggestion raised and declined four times in earlier rounds. The reasoning is the same for all three: this report is built, by explicit standing instruction, as an engineering-grade, fully traceable technical document, not a publication-readability-optimized narrative; its intended use includes serving as a citable audit record where a reader can verify, at the point where any claim appears, exactly what was checked, when, and against what source, without needing to

cross-reference a separate section first. The version-specific phrasing ChatGPT recommends removing from the narrative ("as of v1.24.0," "superseding earlier verification") is not decorative; it is the mechanism by which a reader can distinguish a claim resting on a citation-placement inference from the same claim after direct full-text verification, which has been directly load-bearing at least twice in this report's own history (the v1.11.0 and v1.12.0 hydrology corrections, and the v1.21.0/v1.24.0 population-figure correction, were all only catchable because the report's own text distinguished what was known at each stage from what is known now). Compressing that distinction into a single external table would remove exactly the in-line accountability that let this report's author and its reviewers catch those errors. This is a deliberate scope and audience choice for this report, not an oversight ChatGPT is right to flag as unaddressed; a shorter, narrative-first public-history edition remains a legitimate and separate future deliverable if wanted, built from this report rather than by editing this report into that shape. (Finding 15) The observation that the Source Verification Note now functions as a standalone, publishable evidence audit in its own right is a genuine and accurate compliment; ChatGPT explicitly recommends no change for v1.30.0, and none was made. The possibility of eventually publishing it as a separate companion document, "Source Verification and Bibliographic Assessment for Guaspet Research," is noted here as a future option, not undertaken now. (Finding 16) The observation that the report consistently avoids overstating certainty, and the recommendation to preserve that discipline even against future pressure toward more definitive wording, is affirmed as standing practice; no action needed, logged so this remains an explicit commitment rather than an implicit habit. No factual claim, figure, or finding changed as a result of this pass, and no body text besides this Version Block entry was altered.

v1.30.0 First batch of a ChatGPT review against v1.29.0 adjudicated (five findings, all publication-craftsmanship rather than factual or methodological). Three adopted, one confirmed clean by direct search, one logged as considered but not acted on. (Finding 1) The reviewer's specific example, Section 5's "The City of Inglewood's cultural resources technical section presents a materially different figure," was reworded to lead with the conflicting-evidence framing rather than arrive at it after the fact, per the reviewer's suggested pattern; this single instance was fixed as the reviewer's example, not as the start of a broader voice-consistency sweep, which is a larger, more judgment-heavy task better scoped separately if wanted. (Finding 2) The reviewer's observation that established themes (Wikipedia exclusion, the 193 discrepancy, Volume 5's inaccessibility, Ballona Discovery Park's secondary status) are each re-justified in full at every appearance rather than cross-referenced was logged as a standing consideration rather than acted on now; this report's repeated, self-contained disclosure at each point of use is itself a deliberate feature of its evidentiary-transparency practice, not an oversight, and a global pass trading that redundancy for cross-references is a substantive editorial project of its own that risks weakening exactly the point-of-use verifiability this report has been built around. (Finding 3) Section 8 was restructured from a single flat list into three subsections: 8.1 Remaining Verification Opportunities (five items inviting future work: obtaining Reference 26's full text, revising Section 5 if a defensible population figure surfaces, confirming the 1819 date against original registers, replacing secondary-source citations with primary ones where locatable, and verifying mission-register citations against original images); 8.2 Permanent Limitations of This Report (the two items, the 193-person figure and Volume 5 access, that v1.26.0 and v1.27.0 already reworded from open tasks into acknowledged scope boundaries); and 8.3 Standing Guidance for Derivative Use (the two items governing how future derivative work should and should not draw on this report: rejecting the "8,000 B.C. to 1600 A.D." claim, and maintaining consistent Guaspet/Guashna naming). This adapts the reviewer's suggested two-category split into three, since two of the nine items are neither an invitation to future verification work on this report nor a limitation of this report's own scope, but a rule for how others should use it; forcing them into either of the reviewer's two categories would have misdescribed them.

(Finding 4) The reviewer asked for a global search for "no," "never," "none," and "does not exist" to confirm none of this report's negative claims overstate absolute absence. This search was run directly against the current body text (excluding the historical Version Block, which preserves past states verbatim by design) and found zero instances of "does not exist" or "no source exists," and the only two "never" instances are methodology statements about this report's own sourcing policy ("never as evidence for a finding," "never to support a claim presented as fact"), not empirical claims about the world; no changes were needed. This confirms and extends the same zero-instance finding from the v1.19.0 audit. (Finding 5) The reviewer's observation that the report now reads as technical historical documentation rather than public history, and that this is an advantage for its likely audience, is a positive assessment requiring no action; noted for the record. No factual claim, figure, or finding changed as a result of this pass; all changes are structural (Section 8 subsections) and localized wording (the one Section 5 example sentence).

v1.29.0 Second Perplexity review, against v1.28.0, adjudicated. Unlike the prior round, all four items checked out as accurate against the current text; none were factual misreadings, and all four were adopted. (1) "Over 200 radiocarbon dates" confirmed as the correct wording, already adopted in v1.27.0; no further action needed, reviewer was affirming an existing correction. (2) The PCAD acreage disclosure-without-adoption approach was confirmed as the right call; no change made. (3) Reference 18's diseño classification was confirmed as the more accurate archival term; no change made, already adopted in v1.27.0. (4) Volume 5's accessibility wording, "apparently unpublished, limited-distribution grey literature," was judged too strong for what a bounded online search can actually establish about a volume's formal publication status; reworded in the Section 2.1 table, Section 8's recommendation, and the Reference 2 entry to report the search result itself (no accessible full text located during the July 2026 search) rather than asserting a bibliographic conclusion the search cannot support. Three further items from the same review were checked directly against the text and two were adopted: the Table 1.1 footnote conflated "taken directly from the cited source" with "likely graphical source," implying Homburg's Figure 12 might be a citation basis for the Mission/Pueblo distances rather than unreproduced corroborating cartography; reworded to state plainly that all table distances are cited to Reddy (2015) alone, with the Figure 12 mention separated out and labeled as non-citing context. "Five independent points of direct textual confirmation" and its "four independent points" and "five independent sources" counterparts overstated independence, since several of the five sources for the 92-person figure share the same underlying Stoll/Homburg archival lineage; reworded to "direct textual confirmations" throughout Section 5 and Section 8, with an explicit note that these are not fully independent research bases. The reviewer's fourth item, flagging a possible Reference 2 author/editor naming inconsistency across the document, was checked directly: every live-text mention of Reference 2 already reads "Douglass, Reddy, Ciolek-Torello, and Grenda (2014)" consistently; the only appearances of the earlier "Homburg, Douglass, and Reddy" formulation are inside explanatory clauses in the v1.25.0 changelog entry and the Reference 2 entry itself, both of which are narrating the historical correction by name rather than exhibiting drift. No change was needed; this is recorded here so the same question is not re-raised by a future reviewer without first checking this entry. No factual claim, figure, or finding changed as a result of this round; all changes are wording-precision adjustments to language this report's own body text had overstated relative to what its cited sources or search methodology actually support.

v1.28.0 Perplexity review of v1.27.0 adjudicated. This report independently spot-checked the review's specific factual claims against the actual v1.27.0 text rather than accepting the assessment at face value, consistent with the standing practice established in the v1.20.0 entry below. Two of the review's headline claims did not match the current document and were rejected: (1) the review stated Reference 14 (City of Inglewood EIR) is "still described as search-result snippet only" in the Source Verification Note table; direct comparison shows that

table has read "Full text directly retrieved and read as of v1.21.0, superseding earlier snippet-only verification" since v1.21.0, six versions before this review round. The review appears to have misread the same sentence's separate note about the source URL returning bot-detection blocking on this report's automated fetch tools, which describes a fetch-tooling limitation, not the reference's verification status. (2) The review stated Section 8's top recommendation "still begins with 'Reconcile the 193-person… figure attributed to Homburg, Douglass, and Reddy (2014)…'"; a full-text search of v1.27.0 for that phrase returns zero matches. The actual recommendation, unchanged in substance since v1.24.0 and reworded from an open task to an acknowledged limitation in v1.26.0, explicitly names Reddy (2015) as the EIR's cited source and states that Reddy does not contain a 193 figure. The wording the review quotes matches this report's own v1.6.0-era history, preserved verbatim in this Version Block as a historical record; the review appears to have drawn on that changelog text, a stale cached copy, or a conflated read, rather than the current body text. One additional review item, flagging the Reference 2 editor-attribution change (Homburg, Douglass, and Reddy to Douglass, Reddy, Ciolek-Torello, and Grenda) as a possible unexplained inconsistency, correctly identified a real change across versions but missed that the change is a documented, deliberate correction, explained in the Reference 2 entry itself and the v1.25.0 entry below; no action was needed beyond confirming the explanation is already present. One item was adopted: the review's observation that Section 6's closing two sentences created a minor rhetorical wobble, asserting broader Tongva continuity in one sentence and partially qualifying it in the next, was valid; the two sentences are merged into a tighter construction that states the non-equivalence and the sourcing limit in a single pass, per the review's own suggested phrasing, adopted with minor edits. No other body-text, reference, or table content was altered; this round's overall assessment is that v1.27.0's substantive findings and reference-verification apparatus were already synchronized, and the review's synchronization concerns were themselves not accurate against the current text.

v1.27.0 Two independent verification efforts adjudicated in the same pass. First, the report's author supplied the complete published PDF of Homburg et al. (2014) Volume 1 (Reference 15, 178 pp., Statistical Research Inc. Technical Series 94), superseding the earlier ResearchGate-level verification with direct page citations. Confirmed verbatim, with page numbers now pinned down: the 92-person Guaspet mission-recruitment figure and the "no evidence of recruitment… after 1819" statement (p. 41-42); the project-area location paragraph containing the Centinela Creek/Ballona Escarpment finding underlying this report's v1.11.0-v1.12.0 hydrology corrections (p. 8); the 3.7-5 m elevation range (p. 8-9); and the occupation-hiatus discussion (p. 23-24). Three refinements followed from this closer reading: (1) a new bluff-height figure, 56 m (185 feet) AMSL, not previously in this report, added to Section 1; (2) this report's Section 3 characterization of the radiocarbon dataset as "several hundred" assays is corrected to "over 200," matching the source's own stated figure exactly rather than a looser paraphrase; (3) the Zuniga family's baptismal-officiant role for Guaspet residents (Section 6) is now dated specifically to 1803-1809, per Homburg et al.'s account of the family's 1805 death and 1808-1809 departure from the Ballona. The source's own Figure 12 (a satellite photograph locating the project area relative to the Pueblo and the missions, p. 41) is noted in Table 1.1 as the likely graphical basis for this report's mission/pueblo distance figures, without being reproduced here. Second, four previously snippet-only references were upgraded to full-text-verified by direct retrieval: Reference 16 (LA County Ballona Creek Interceptor), confirming the creek-length and watershed figures verbatim and adding a jurisdictional watershed breakdown to Section 1, with a note that the source domain now primarily hosts unrelated Trash Interceptor content though the cited creek-description subpage remains live; Reference 18 (California State Archives), confirmed as a diseño (hand-drawn boundary sketch map) rather than grant-deed text, with the report's description corrected accordingly; Reference 19 (PCAD), confirming the 1837 Alvarado-to-Avila grant and disclosing a within-source

acreage inconsistency (22,460 versus 22,458 acres) this report does not adopt; and Reference 22 (Indigenous Peoples Major Group), confirming the "over 20-mile" Pimu voyaging distance and asphaltum-pine-pitch sealant verbatim. References 17 and 20 remain this report's only snippet-only sources. Separately, a dedicated search for accessible full text of Douglass, Reddy, Ciolek-Torello, and Grenda (2014), Volume 5 (Reference 2) was conducted across ResearchGate, academia.edu, WorldCat/ISBN listings, and SRI's own project pages; none was found, and the volume appears to remain unpublished, limited-distribution grey literature, unlike Volume 1, which has its own independent ResearchGate upload. This upgrades Section 8's Volume 5 item from an unverified assumption of inaccessibility to a documented, dated search effort with the same negative result; it does not change this report's conclusions. No factual claim, figure, or finding in this report changed as a result of this pass; all changes are citation-precision upgrades, page citations, and disclosure of a completed search effort.

v1.26.0 The report's author determined that further pursuit of two items carried in Section 8 is beyond this report's scope: contacting the City of Inglewood or its EIR preparer for clarification on the source of the 193-person figure, and obtaining Douglass, Reddy, Ciolek-Torello, and Grenda (2014) Volume 5 or the related not-yet-published Vargas et al. volume. Both Section 8 bullets are reworded from active recommendations into acknowledged, permanent limitations on this report's population and settlement-form sections. This is a scoping decision, not a retraction of either item's substance: the underlying disclosures made in v1.21.0 through v1.25.0 (that Reddy (2015) does not support the 193 figure attributed to it, that 92 is corroborated by five independent sources, and that Volume 5 and Volume 2 remain secondhand citations) are unchanged. No other body-text or reference content was altered.

v1.25.0 The report's author supplied the complete published PDF of Reddy (2015), including its figures, maps, and full reference list, superseding the text-only academia.edu version read for v1.24.0. Reddy's own reference list surfaced a real citation error in this report, present since Reference 2 was first added: this report had attributed the editorship of Volume 5 of the Ballona synthesis series, Gabrielino/Tongva Origins and Development: A View from Guaspet*, to Homburg, Douglass, and Reddy. Per Reddy (2015)'s own citation of that volume, the correct editors are Douglass, Reddy, Ciolek-Torello, and Grenda; Homburg co-edited Volume 1 (Reference 15) but is not among Volume 5's editors. This is corrected in Reference 2 and in every other body-text mention of Volume 5's authorship (Executive Summary, Section 2.1 table, Section 5, Section 8). Two existing v1.24.0 additions were also refined for citation precision: the "more than 300 individuals" Mission-period burial count at CA-LAN-62 is now attributed correctly to Vargas, Douglass, and Reddy (in press), a not-yet-published volume Reddy herself cites, rather than presented as Reddy's own count; and the "mid-1810s and before AD 1816" abandonment estimate is now attributed to Reddy, Douglass, Stanton, Ciolek-Torello, and Grenda (in press), a specific not-yet-published chapter, rather than generically to "her own in-press work." Two new items were added from the fuller reading: Reddy (2015) states Mission San Gabriel is approximately 22 miles northeast of the Ballona and the Pueblo de Los Angeles approximately 14 miles northeast, both added to Table 1.1 as new precise distances; and Reddy (2015), citing Gamble and Russell (2002), gives a generic Gabrielino/Tongva village population upper range of "up to 400-500," added to Section 5 as an explicitly non-Guaspet-specific data point sitting above every other proxy in this report. The article's Figure 1 (regional overview map) and Figure 2 (LAN-62/LAN-211 site map relative to Jefferson Boulevard, Lincoln Boulevard, and the Westchester Bluffs) are noted in Reference 25 as additional cartographic corroboration of this report's existing Section 1 location description, though not reproduced here.*

v1.24.0 The report's author located and supplied the actual Reddy (2015) article, "Feeding Family and Ancestors," via academia.edu, resolving this report's single longest-standing open item, carried since v1.6.0, though not in the direction that item's framing had assumed. Full-text reading establishes that Reddy (2015) does not contain a 193-person figure anywhere in its text; this report searched specifically for the number and found no occurrence. Instead, Reddy (2015) independently states the 92-person, 1788-to-1815 mission-recruitment figure in terms matching every other source already used in this report, citing Homburg et al. (2014) and Stoll et al. (2009), giving the 92 figure a fifth independent point of direct textual confirmation (References 1, 6, 13, 15, and now 25). The City of Inglewood EIR's attribution of the 193-person figure to this source, inferred by this report in v1.21.0 from citation placement, is therefore not supported once the source itself is read directly; this report cannot determine from its own documents whether this reflects an EIR miscitation, a misplaced footnote, or an unspecified different source, and discloses the problem rather than resolving it further. Section 5's two population paragraphs, the "Taken together" summary, the Executive Summary disclaimer bullet, the Section 2.1 source-verification table, the Source Verification Note, References 14 and 25, the Verified source URLs list, and Section 8's top recommendation were all updated accordingly; the top recommendation now calls for contacting the City of Inglewood or its EIR preparer, ESA, directly for clarification, rather than obtaining Reddy (2015), which has been done. Two secondary, minor items surfaced from the same full-text reading and were disclosed rather than adopted as corrections: Reddy (2015) dates the CA-LAN-62/CA-LAN-211 Mission Period settlement's abandonment to "circa 1818" or "before AD 1816," a few years earlier than the roughly-1819 date used elsewhere in this report, added to Section 6 alongside the existing date; and Reddy (2015) states the CA-LAN-62 Mission-period burial area specifically contains "more than 300 individuals," disclosed in Section 3 alongside this report's existing approximately-four-hundred figure without attempting reconciliation. Reference 25's author-name spelling question, raised as unresolved in v1.22.0 and v1.23.0, is now settled: the published article confirms "Reddy," and the EIR's "Reedy" is a misspelling of the same scholar, Seetha N. Reddy.

v1.23.0 The report's author searched for Reedy (2015), "Feeding Family and Ancestors," the article this report identified in v1.21.0 as the likely source of the 193-person population figure, and supplied instead the abstract of a different article: Ciolek-Torrello, Homburg, Reddy, Douglass, and Grenda (2013), "Living in the Ballona Wetlands of the Southern California Coast," Journal of Wetland Archaeology, Vol. 13. This is not the article cited in the Inglewood EIR's footnote 30; it has a different title, journal, year, and page range, and does not resolve the 92-versus-193 population discrepancy, which remains this report's single highest-priority open item. It was added to this report on its own merits as Reference 26, with two disclosed effects. First, its abstract describes a previously undocumented abandonment episode, approximately 800 to 400 cal BP, distinct from the approximately-6,000-to-4,500-or-5,000-years-ago hiatus already disclosed in Section 3 as of v1.22.0; this is added to Section 3 as an open item, explicitly not merged into Table 3.1, since only the abstract, not the 28-page full text, was accessible, and this report has not determined whether this later abandonment is the same event as, or distinct from, the approximately-1,000-years-ago contraction already documented from Reference 4. Second, the 2013 article consistently spells its Statistical Research, Inc. coauthor's name "Reddy," the same spelling used elsewhere in this report for Seetha N. Reddy, co-editor of the Ballona synthesis series (Reference 2); this is noted in Reference 25 as suggestive but not confirmatory evidence that the Inglewood EIR's "Reedy" is a variant spelling of the same person, since the actual 2015 article establishing the 193-person figure has still not been obtained or read. A new Section 8 recommendation was added, ranked below the Reedy (2015) recommendation, to obtain the full text of Reference 26 and determine its relationship to this report's existing chronology.

v1.22.0 The report's author supplied the full text of Homburg et al. (2014) Volume 1, already cited in this report as Reference 15 and previously verified only "via ResearchGate" rather than read closely against every claim it might bear on. Direct full-text reading against Sections 3, 5, and 6 surfaced three items, none of which alters this report's conclusions but all of which improve citation precision and disclosure. First, Reference 15 independently states the 92-person Guaspet mission-recruitment figure in the same terms already used in this report, citing Stoll et al. (2009) and pointing to Volume 5; this is added to Section 5 as a third independent point of direct textual confirmation for the 92 figure, alongside References 1, 6, and 13, strengthening the citation chain without changing the figure itself. Second, a minor date discrepancy was found and disclosed rather than silently resolved: this report's existing citation (Reference 6, Ballona Discovery Park) states the Rancho de los Quintos grant occurred in 1803, while Reference 15 states "sometime around 1804," citing Mason (2004) and Stoll et al. (2009); Section 6 now reads "around 1803 to 1804" and discloses both sources rather than asserting false precision. Third, and more substantively, a chronology discrepancy was identified between this report's two directly-verified technical sources for Ballona-area occupation dating: Section 3's occupation-gap figure of approximately 6,000 to 4,500 years ago is sourced to ESA (2015), Reference 4; Homburg et al. (2014) Volume 1 describes what appears to be the same broader Ballona-wide hiatus with different endpoints, approximately 6,000 to 5,000 years ago per SRI's analysis of several hundred radiocarbon assays, while also noting that Van Horn's original identification of the hiatus proposed a nearly 2,000-year span before SRI's expanded dataset narrowed it. This report has not attempted to adjudicate between the two technical reports' underlying radiocarbon datasets, which is beyond what this report's own sourcing can support; both figures are now disclosed in Section 3's body text and in a new footnote to Table 3.1, following the same disclosure-over-false-resolution practice already established for the 92-versus-193 population discrepancy in Section 5. Reference 15's entry in the References list was expanded to reflect all three uses. This report's single highest-priority open item remains unchanged from v1.21.0: obtaining and directly reading Reedy (2015), the source underlying the 193-person population figure, which none of this version's findings address.

v1.21.0 Two items adjudicated. First, a ChatGPT review round against v1.20.0 (six numbered observations, all publication-refinement rather than substantive corrections): the report was assessed as having reached a stable analytical state, with no recurring pattern of historical or archaeological weakness remaining; a suggestion to eventually split the Version Block into separate research and reader editions was logged as a standing option for future publication packaging, not acted on now; the report's uncertainty-language discipline and Section 8 prioritization were both affirmed as already in place; a caution against adding further methodology was logged as a continued constraint on future revisions, consistent with the same caution raised in the prior ChatGPT round; and the review's one substantive open question, the provenance of the 193-person figure, is addressed by the second item below. Second, and substantially more significant: the report's author obtained and supplied the full text of the City of Inglewood EIR's cultural resources technical section (Reference 14), previously verified only through a search-result snippet because the source URL returns bot-detection blocking on this report's own automated fetch tools. Direct reading of the full text corrected a citation error that had stood since v1.6.0: the 193-person, circa-1790-to-1820 figure had been attributed in this report to "Homburg, Douglass, and Reddy (2014) among other sources," an inference made from partial snippet information; the EIR's actual text places both the occupation-date claim and the 193-person claim under a single citation to a different, more specific source, a 2015 journal article by Reedy on Mission-period Native American lifeways in coastal Southern California, now added as Reference 25. This also resolved a previously open scope question: the EIR explicitly ties the 193-person figure to "the rancheria," meaning Guaspet/Guasna/Gaucha specifically, not a broader multi-site grouping the figure might otherwise have compressed. Section 5, Section 8's top recommendation,

the Section 2.1 source-verification table, the Source Verification Note, Reference 14, and the Verified source URLs list were all updated to reflect the corrected attribution, the resolved scope question, and Reference 14's upgrade to full-text-verified status. The underlying numerical discrepancy between 92 and 193 remains unreconciled and is now stated as depending on direct access to Reedy (2015) itself, not the EIR's summary of it; this is carried forward as the single highest-priority open item, superseding the prior recommendation to consult Homburg et al. (2014) for this purpose. A secondary, incidental finding from the same full-text reading was also incorporated: the EIR quotes McCawley (1996, pp. 62-63) describing a historic Rancho Sausal Redondo map showing Guaspita on the east bank of Ballona Creek, giving this report its first page-level citation to McCawley (1996), still cited secondhand rather than directly read. This correction follows the same pattern as the v1.11.0 and v1.12.0 hydrology corrections: a citation-accuracy error survived multiple AI review rounds, including the v1.10.0 provenance audit specifically designed to catch this class of error, because the underlying primary source was inaccessible to this report's own tools; it was caught only once the author supplied the document directly.

v1.20.0 Perplexity readiness review adjudicated (fresh baseline against v1.19.0, framed as a publication-readiness assessment for Internet Archive upload rather than a line-item findings list). The review checked factual soundness across all body sections, internal consistency, and citation hygiene, and reported no factual claim in the text that contradicts its cited sources, no hallucinated sources or invented data, and no unresolved internal inconsistency. This report independently spot-checked the review's specific factual claims against the actual v1.19.0 text rather than accepting the assessment at face value: the Section 3 chronology figures cited (CA-LAN-64 at 8,000 to 7,000 years ago, CA-LAN-62 occupation onset at approximately 6,500 years ago, the 6,000-to-4,500-year occupation gap, renewed occupation from 4,500 to 4,000 years ago, and contraction to CA-LAN-47, CA-LAN-62, and CA-LAN-211 by approximately 1,000 years ago) match Section 3 and Table 3.1 exactly, and the measured-versus-reconstructed distinction, Wikipedia-removal status, and Source Verification Note tiering were confirmed accurate on direct comparison. No corrections were required. Two suggestions were disposed of without a body-text change: (1) a recommendation to retain the "Status: Draft" label, already unchanged since v1.0.0, requiring no action; (2) a recommendation to add a note to this report's future Internet Archive listing description, separate from the report itself, emphasizing that population figures are estimates pending direct access to Homburg et al. (2014) Volume 5 and the full City of Inglewood EIR; this is accompanying-metadata guidance rather than a change to the document, and is deferred as a distinct deliverable if requested. This round's overall conclusion, that v1.19.0 is suitable for Internet Archive upload as a draft technical report with its existing "Status: Draft" label and caveats intact, is noted; no factual or structural issue was found requiring resolution before the next review round.

v1.19.0 ChatGPT forensic-review round adjudicated (fresh baseline against v1.18.0, twelve findings, numbered 1 through 12). This round explicitly framed itself as publication-polish and referee-style review rather than a search for new substantive historical, archaeological, or hydrological errors, and found none comparable to the major issues resolved in earlier revisions. Three findings adopted: (Finding 1) added a new opening sentence to the Executive Summary stating plainly that the title reflects the questions this report investigates rather than documented findings, and pointing to "What This Report Does Not Claim" for the full limitation, so the scope caveat reaches the reader before the title's population/last-resident framing does, rather than only in that later section. (Finding 2) added a sentence to the Section 1 site-location paragraph distinguishing the measured coastal distance (Reference 15) from the reconstructed position relative to the lagoon's historic tidal inlet (Reference 23), since that one sentence had been combining a measured figure and a historical reconstruction without flagging the difference in evidentiary tier. (Finding 4) reworded the opening of the 193-person

paragraph in Section 5 to name the City of Inglewood's technical section as the grammatical subject rather than only identifying it mid-sentence, consistent with this report's established practice of naming sources directly rather than using passive constructions. Declined or requiring no action: (Finding 3) a documented-versus-inferential transition cue for Section 5 was judged already present; the existing closing paragraph of Section 5 already states the population range is "a source-bounded estimate, not a measured population… inferential… intended to express order of magnitude only." (Finding 5) a terminology sweep for archaeological/historical vocabulary drift found no misuse, an affirmation rather than a finding. (Finding 6) an observation that the report's methodological transparency is a strength, with a caution to keep it from overshadowing the historical narrative in future revisions; logged as a standing consideration, no v1.19.0 action. (Finding 7) a suggestion to tighten the Source Verification Note's scope was checked against the actual Note, which is two introductory sentences, a verification-status table, and one closing sentence; found already tightly scoped, with the methodological detail ChatGPT was likely responding to residing in the Version Block by design, per the v1.14.0 precedent of keeping self-referential and methodological narrative out of body text. (Finding 8) a check for "not located" versus "does not exist" phrasing drift found zero instances of absolute non-existence language anywhere in the document; verified clean. (Finding 9) a request to audit compound sentences mixing evidentiary strength in Sections 1 and 5 identified the same sentence already corrected under Finding 2, and found Section 5's compound sentences already carry adequate per-clause hedging; no separate action taken to avoid redundant re-editing of the same sentence. (Finding 10) positive observation on the report's neutral, non-advocacy tone; affirmed as standing practice. (Finding 11) positive observation on the Recommendations section's prioritization; affirmed as already following the effect-on-conclusions-first ordering described. (Finding 12) an overall observation that the report has shifted from synthesis toward documentation in character, with a caution to preserve narrative flow in future revisions; logged as a standing consideration alongside Finding 6, no v1.19.0 action. This reviewer's closing assessment, that remaining review is likely to concern reference precision, caption wording, and citation placement rather than the report's underlying analysis, is noted; the next review round is expected from Perplexity.

v1.18.0 Self-directed audit, prompted by ChatGPT's explicit statement that its prior reviews covered methodology, reasoning, and consistency but not citation-by-citation verification, a reverse citation audit, red-teaming, a terminology audit, a citation-density audit, a redundancy audit, or a figure audit, and that independent inspection of primary sources beyond what is directly quoted is a hard limit it shares with this report's own process. Rather than only acknowledging that gap, the following audits were actually run against the current build, not merely described. Terminology audit: checked rancheria/village/settlement and occupation/abandonment/recruitment usage across the document; found the variation reflects appropriate register differences (rancheria for the specific historical-legal term, village for general description, settlement for the recurring "independently functioning settlement" phrase) rather than inconsistency, and confirmed the one remaining instance of source-reported language ("no longer occupied," attributed to Ballona Discovery Park in Section 6) is deliberately left unstandardized because it reports what that source states, not this report's own phrasing. Citation-density audit: programmatically scanned every paragraph and bullet for citation count; found 42 substantive zero-citation passages, the large majority of which are methodology statements, recommendations, or changelog entries that do not require citations, but this scan caught three real gaps that would not have surfaced otherwise: (1) the paragraph stating Ballona Creek's core hydrological finding (interior terminal lagoon, spring-fed, narrow tidal inlet) had lost its citation to Reference 23 entirely when it was split into shorter paragraphs during an earlier readability pass; restored. (2) the claim that Ballona Discovery Park is 0.3 miles from the village core and hosts the Guaspet monument had no citation; added References 6 and 21.

(3) Section 6 asserted that continued Tongva presence in the Ballona after 1819 was "a pattern consistent with the wider history of Tongva communities across the Los Angeles Basin," a broader historical generalization with no source behind it; reworded to state plainly that this report has not located a specific source for that claim and that the narrower point (village abandonment is not regional depoponation) is a logical distinction already established, not an independently documented finding. Figure and table audit: confirmed the location table, chronology table, source-verification table, and Source Verification Note table each support specific claims rather than merely decorating, and found a real labeling inconsistency, a figure numbered "Figure 1a" breaking the sequence between Figures 1 and 2; renumbered all five figures sequentially (1 through 5) and added a "Table 1.1" label to the previously unlabeled location table for parity with the existing "Table 3.1" chronology label. Redundancy audit: counted body-text (not changelog) mentions of the Wikipedia-rejection theme, found two, each serving a distinct purpose (general methodology statement versus a specific claim rejection), and judged this proportionate rather than excessive. What this audit could not do, and does not claim to have done: independently inspect Hancock's original 1857-58 survey document, Homburg et al.'s full excavation report, or any other primary source beyond what has already been directly retrieved and quoted in this report (see the Source Verification Note for exactly which sources that includes); a true reverse citation audit and red-team review of every sentence against a skeptical domain expert's standard remain bounded by the same access limitations ChatGPT itself named, and this report does not overstate what this pass accomplished.

v1.17.0-style review adjudicated, covering Sections 6, 7, and 8 (Contact-Period Interaction and Displacement; Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Landscape Transformation; Recommendations for Further Verification). Sixteen findings (51 through 66) reviewed; nearly all adopted. Adopted: (Finding 51) added an explicit sentence to Section 6 stating that the listed 1780s-1800s events (grazing encroachment, the 1787 dispute, the 1803 rancho, the Zuniga family's role in later baptisms) are presented in documented sequence, that no source establishes any one of them as the direct cause of Guaspet's decline, and that this report does not assert a specific causal mechanism. (Finding 52) standardized the Section 3 timeline table's abandonment phrasing from "Guaspet no longer occupied as an independently functioning village" to the shorter, more consistent "Guaspet ceased functioning as an independent village," matching the terminology already used in Sections 2 and 6; the one place this phrase differs, Section 6's report of what a secondary source itself states ("no longer occupied"), and the direct quotation from Reference 13 ("no longer inhabited"), were both left unchanged, since altering language attributed to a source would misrepresent what that source actually says. (Findings 55 and 62) restructured Section 7 from one continuous narrative into four sub-headed phases: 7.1 Mission, Rancho, and Agricultural Use; 7.2 Flood Control and Channelization; 7.3 Modern Development and the 2004 Discovery; 7.4 Modern Tribal Consultation and Agency Recognition. (Finding 56) added a sentence to the new Section 7.2 stating explicitly that channelization is one documented driver of twentieth-century environmental change among others, not the sole explanation for every subsequent landscape change. (Finding 57) added a sentence to the new Section 7.3 stating that the 2004 discovery is discussed for its archaeological significance to the occupation history, not for the modern legal, regulatory, or reburial-process disputes connected to it, which lie outside this report's scope. (Finding 59) added the reviewer's suggested sentence nearly verbatim to the new Section 7.4: this report cites the Coastal Commission document only as evidence of formal tribal consultation and agency recognition of ancestral territory. (Finding 60) added a new Section 8 recommendation to verify mission-register citations against original register images rather than published transcriptions alone. (Finding 61) added a new Section 8 recommendation to maintain consistent Guaspet/Guashna naming conventions in derivative publications, following this report's established usage. Considered but not changed: (Finding 54, terminology consistency across Mission period/Mission-period/mission and rancho/Mexican-era) was audited

directly; the apparent variation follows standard English hyphenation rules (a compound adjective is hyphenated only when it precedes the noun it modifies, for example "Mission-period occupation" versus "during the Mission period") rather than reflecting inconsistency, so no change was made. (Finding 64, adjective discipline) was reviewed specifically for Sections 6 through 8; no unjustified instances of "significant," "important," or "major" were found in the material added or edited this round. Findings 53, 58, 63, 65, and 66 required no action, being affirmations of choices already made. This reviewer's closing note, that the remaining major review is references, the Source Verification Note, figures, captions, URLs, and version history, is consistent with this report's own standing preference for engineering-grade detail in exactly those areas and is expected to be the next review round.

v1.16.0-style review adjudicated, covering Sections 3, 4, and 5 (Archaeological Chronology, Settlement Form, Population). Seventeen findings (34 through 50) reviewed; nearly all adopted. Adopted: (Finding 34) added a sentence to Section 3 clarifying that the 8,000-to-1,000-year chronology describes the broader Ballona archaeological landscape, not continuous occupation of the historical village of Guaspet specifically, which is a Mission-period identity documented at the CA-LAN-62 locale. (Finding 35) reworded "sparsely occupied" to "archaeological evidence for occupation is sparse, if present at all," with an added clause that absence of recovered evidence is not itself proof of absence of occupation. (Finding 37) reordered the trade-goods sentence to lead with glass beads specifically rather than the generic "European trade goods." (Finding 38) changed "approximately four hundred sets of ancestral remains" to "the remains of approximately four hundred ancestral individuals," matching more respectful modern archaeological usage. (Finding 39) expanded Section 4 with a new paragraph on Guaspet's spatial setting (elevation, bluff-base position, proximity to the lagoon and Centinela Creek margin), drawn from data already cited elsewhere in this report (Reference 15), while explicitly declining to adopt any specific claim about house count or arrangement, since no source supports one. (Finding 41) added a sentence to Section 5 distinguishing the absence of a documentary population figure from the absence of an archaeological one, noting neither has been located. (Finding 43) added an explicit reminder that mission recruitment counts should not be read as equivalent to village population at any given time, given recruitment was cumulative and staggered across nearly three decades. (Finding 45) added a Table 3.1 chronology summary after the two occupation-sequence paragraphs, running from 8,000 years ago through the circa-1819 abandonment, so readers can process the sequence visually rather than only in prose. (Finding 47) reduced repeated use of "kiiy" in Section 4 to a single introduction of the term, using "such houses" afterward. (Finding 50) closed Section 5 with a sentence noting that future discoveries, particularly direct access to Homburg et al. (2014) Volume 5, may refine or replace the population estimates given. Considered but not changed: (Finding 46, standardizing years-ago versus BC/AD usage) was reviewed and left as-is; the mixed register is intentional rather than inconsistent, since deep-time chronology in Sections 3 to 4 uses years-before-present convention, historical-period dates in Sections 5 to 6 use calendar years, and the one BC/AD instance describes, in the terms of the original source, a claim this report explicitly rejects, which should not be restated in this report's own preferred convention. Findings 36, 40, 42, 44, 48, and 49 required no action, being affirmations of choices already made. This reviewer, unlike the two AI reviewers in earlier rounds, explicitly noted a limit on its own review: it had not independently inspected every underlying cited source and was working from uploaded excerpts, a disclosure consistent with the Source Verification Note's own practice of stating confidence levels rather than implying uniform certainty.

v1.15.0-style review adjudicated, covering Section 2 (Archaeological Identification and Site Correlation) and the Source Verification Table. Eighteen findings (16 through 33) reviewed; nearly all adopted, none declined outright this round, though some were folded into others rather than actioned separately. Adopted: (Finding 16) replaced

"resolved this naming uncertainty by confirming" with "demonstrated… that the documented rancheria was recorded as Guaspet or Guasna," since archaeological identification is rarely permanently closed and "demonstrated" better reflects that. (Findings 17 and 19, combined) added an explicit closing sentence to the naming paragraph: this report treats Guaspet/Guasna and Sa'angna as distinct names "unless future primary evidence demonstrates otherwise," framed as a methodological decision for this report specifically, not a historical pronouncement. (Finding 18 and 33) the land-grant paragraph now explicitly and repeatedly distinguishes "permit" (1822) from "grant" (1837) rather than relying on context, and bolds the three key dates (1822, 1837, 1855) for visual scanability. (Finding 20) tightened the Corral de Guaspita sentence to state explicitly that it demonstrates place-name persistence in a "transformed, utilitarian, rancher's usage" only, and does not evidence continuous Gabrielino/Tongva cultural memory or presence, closing off an inference the prior wording did not intend but also did not foreclose. (Finding 21) changed "village itself was no longer occupied" to "village had ceased functioning as an independent settlement" to match the terminology already used in Section 6, leaving the direct quotation from Reference 13 unchanged since altering quoted text would misrepresent the source. (Finding 23) added a fourth table column, Verification status, with four standardized categories: Directly verified, Verified secondhand, Conflicting evidence, and Pending direct verification (a fifth value, Rejected/not adopted, was added for the one row documenting a claim this report rejects rather than supports, since none of the reviewer's four categories fit that row cleanly). (Finding 24) moved the Homburg et al. Volume 5 row, the table's weakest-verified entry, to the bottom, so the table now runs from strongest to weakest evidence. (Finding 25) bolded "Conflicts with" in the 193-person row for visual emphasis. (Finding 26) standardized the Reliability note column to a consistent short vocabulary: Peer-reviewed primary source, Government technical report, Primary archival source, Institutional summary, Popular sources, and Peer-reviewed secondary source, replacing the previous ad hoc mix of openings ("Primary…", "Technical…", "Now corroborated…"). (Finding 27) added an italicized footnote after the table stating that reliability reflects claim-specific evidentiary strength, not a rating of the cited publication overall. The reviewer's framing sentence for the table ("this table is intended to allow readers to distinguish documented historical findings from unresolved questions and inferential conclusions") was adopted essentially verbatim as the table's introductory sentence. Not separately actioned: (Finding 29, "this report" vs. "the present report") and (Finding 30, varying "strongest available source") were both cosmetic wording-variety suggestions; the Reliability-note standardization in Finding 26 already varies this language throughout the table, which was judged sufficient without a further pass hunting for every remaining instance of either phrase. Findings 22, 28, 31, and 32 required no action, being affirmations of choices already made.

v1.14.0-style review of v1.13.0 (Executive Summary and Section 1) adjudicated. Fifteen numbered findings were reviewed individually; most were adopted, a few declined with reasons given rather than silently ignored. Adopted: (Finding 3) reworded "Ballona Creek historically had no ocean outlet at all" to the more defensible "Ballona Creek did not historically discharge directly into the Pacific Ocean," which does not overstate the case against an objection that the tidal inlet was itself a form of ocean connection. (Findings 2 and 5) trimmed self-referential correction language ("this report previously stated…", "that correction was itself incomplete", "this distinction was absent from earlier versions of this report") out of the Executive Summary and Section 1 body text; that narrative remains fully documented in this Version Block, the more appropriate location for it. (Finding 4) made the Hancock-versus-McMahon citation relationship explicit: the body now reads "Henry Hancock (1857 to 1858)… as analyzed in the companion Ballona Creek Terminus Report" rather than attributing Hancock's findings to the secondary source alone. (Findings 6 and 7) split the dense, six-idea hydrology paragraph into four shorter paragraphs. (Finding 8) softened "it was Centinela Creek, not Ballona Creek, that ran closest to the

bluffs" to "the excavation report indicates that Centinela Creek, rather than Ballona Creek, was the drainage immediately adjacent to the village," keeping the claim tied explicitly to its source. (Finding 11) added an italicized footnote under the location table distinguishing estimated distances from source-stated ones. (Finding 12) simplified the creek-length sentence to a single figure, approximately 9 miles. (Finding 14) softened "Every substantive claim in this report is instead traceable to…" to "This report is intended to make every substantive claim traceable to…" since an unqualified absolute invites exception-hunting a hedged standard does not. Added as a new section, not an edit: a "Method of Historical Reconstruction" note immediately after the Executive Summary, stating this report's five-tier evidentiary hierarchy explicitly and pointing to the existing Source Verification Note for the claim-by-claim accounting. Declined: (Finding 1) the retitling suggestion, raised for a fourth time across two reviewers, is again not applied unilaterally; the title was set by explicit instruction, and the title-content tension is already addressed in the Executive Summary and the new Method note. (Finding 15) treated as substantially addressed by the Finding 6-7 paragraph breaks rather than acted on separately. Findings 9, 10, and 13 required no action, being affirmations of choices already made.

v1.12.0 Second creek-course correction, again identified by the author, not by AI review, within the same conversation as v1.11.0. The village description in Section 1 had referred only to Ballona Creek in describing Guaspet's immediate setting at the base of the Westchester Bluffs. The excavation report already cited as Reference 15 (Homburg et al. 2014, Vol. 1), full-text verified since v1.8.0, states directly that Centinela Creek, not Ballona Creek, ran along the base of the Ballona Escarpment (the Westchester Bluffs), while Ballona Creek crossed the broader project area without that specific claim. This fact was present in this report's own source material the entire time; it was not surfaced or connected to the village-setting description until the author raised the question directly and supplied two additional primary source collections (a Ballona Creek Terminus companion document and an Internet Archive collection of Centinela Creek maps and aerial photography) as corroboration. Section 1 is revised to name Centinela Creek specifically as the drainage adjacent to the village, cited to Reference 15. The supplementary Internet Archive collection is added as Reference 24, explicitly and narrowly cited: this report's author confirmed the collection's metadata, subject listing, and file titles (1876 T-Sheet 1432B annotation, 1927 and 1934 aerial photography, a GIS channel map, and the 1891 Freeman springs survey) but could not read the underlying map annotations or photograph captions directly, since image content is not accessible to this report's research tools; it is therefore cited as corroborating, not primary, evidence, with the primary citation for the Centinela Creek finding remaining Reference 15. Combined with v1.11.0, this means the two most significant substantive errors in this report's entire revision history, both concerning the historical hydrology of the site rather than citation form or Wikipedia reliance, were caught exclusively by the author's direct knowledge of the physical landscape, not by any of the four AI review passes (two Claude, one Perplexity twice, one ChatGPT) this document had already been through. That pattern is worth stating plainly rather than glossing over: source verification and citation auditing are necessary but not sufficient for a report like this one.

v1.11.0 Major hydrological correction, identified by the author (domain expert on Ballona geography), not by any AI review pass, and not caught across ten prior versions or four independent AI review rounds. This report had repeatedly stated or implied that Ballona Creek historically flowed to a direct ocean outlet (variously located "at the mouth of Ballona Creek" or, after the v1.8.0 correction, generically "southwest near Del Rey Lagoon"). Both framings were wrong in the same underlying way: they projected the modern, engineered condition of Ballona Creek, an artifact of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers channelization completed circa 1938, backward onto the entire historical period relevant to this report, including all of Guaspet's occupation. Per the author's own Ballona Creek Terminus Report (McMahon 2026, v5.72, now Reference 23), primary federal survey evidence, chiefly the sworn Hancock survey of 1857-58 and the court-certified Courtney partition map of 1867-68,

establishes that Ballona Creek historically discharged into an interior terminal lagoon, not the ocean directly. That lagoon was connected to the sea only by a narrow (5 to 6 foot), intermittently closed tidal inlet located near what is now Del Rey Lagoon; the creek's own discharge point into the lagoon lay approximately 1.25 miles further inland (east) of that inlet. A permanent, direct engineered connection between Ballona Creek and the ocean did not exist until the 1938 channelization. Section 1 and the Executive Summary are substantially rewritten to state this directly, with the historic tidal inlet and the modern engineered outlet now treated as two distinct things in both the location table and the map figure caption. This finding also sharpens Section 4 and 5's existing description of the village's setting "at the margin of the lagoon and floodplain," which was already directionally correct but had not been connected to the specific historical hydrology now cited. This correction illustrates a limit of the review process used throughout this document's revision history: source verification, citation-accuracy audits, and multiple independent AI reviews can catch miscitation, unsupported claims, and internal inconsistency, but none of that substitutes for a subject-matter expert's direct knowledge of the physical landscape being described. The author caught this one.

v1.10.0 Full sentence-by-sentence provenance audit, per explicit standing instruction to hold this report to the standard "can every sentence be defended solely from the cited scholarly sources if Wikipedia disappeared tomorrow." This went beyond simply removing Wikipedia citations (done in v1.9.0) to re-checking whether every remaining citation actually, specifically supports the sentence it is attached to. The audit found two real citation-accuracy errors, independent of the Wikipedia question, and one methodological gap: (1) the Executive Summary's "0.5 km inland" distance claim was cited to Reference 1 (Stoll et al. 2009, a mission-register study with no geographic-survey content); corrected to Reference 15 (Homburg et al. 2014, Vol. 1), the actual source of that figure. (2) The "20 to 22 miles offshore" Pimu/Catalina distance was cited to References 6 and 17, neither of which was confirmed to state that figure in the text actually retrieved for this report; the specific source that does state it (a non-Wikipedia article from the Indigenous Peoples Major Group for Sustainable Development) had been read during research but never formally added as a reference. It is now Reference 22, and the citation is corrected to point to it. (3) Added an explicit methodology bullet to "What This Report Does Not Claim" stating outright that open-edit and AI-generated encyclopedias are not treated as evidence anywhere in this report, rather than leaving that policy to be inferred from citation patterns alone. Also went further than demoting Wikipedia: References 9 and 10 (the two Wikipedia articles) have been removed from the References and Verified source URLs lists entirely, not merely labeled as unused; the one remaining in-text mention of Wikipedia (identifying the origin of the rejected New Mexico trade claim) is now plain prose with no citation marker or bookmark link, since there is no longer a reference entry for it to link to. Reference numbers 9 and 10 are left as an intentional gap rather than renumbering every subsequent citation, to avoid introducing new errors through a high-risk global renumbering pass. Finally, added a new Source Verification Note and table, placed immediately before the References list, that classifies every reference by how it was actually verified: full-text retrieved and read, cited secondhand with that fact disclosed, or verified only via a search-result snippet. Seven references (1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 21) plus Reference 15 rest on full-text verification. Six references (16 through 20, and 22) rest on snippet-only verification and are disclosed as such; the land-grant facts among them (18-20) are cross-corroborated across three independent sources, which partially, not fully, offsets the snippet-only status of each individually.

v1.9.0 Full removal of Wikipedia as a factual source, per explicit standing instruction: Wikipedia is unreliable for Ballona/Tongva subject matter specifically and must never be cited in support of a claim, only (if at all) as the identified origin of a rejected claim. Every remaining citation to Wikipedia in this report was located and either replaced with an independently verified source or explicitly demoted. Specific changes: (1) the Ballona Creek

length/watershed description is now cited to Los Angeles County's official Ballona Creek Interceptor page (Reference 16) instead of Wikipedia. (2) The te'aat/asphaltum construction and Pimu voyaging-distance claims are now cited to USC Dornsife's Ti'at Society article (Reference 17) and Ballona Discovery Park (Reference 6) instead of Wikipedia; the "Baldwin Hills specifically" tar-source detail, which could not be independently confirmed anywhere, is now stated as unconfirmed rather than cited to Wikipedia at all. (3) The Johnston 1962/McCawley 1996 naming-history account is now cited directly to Stoll, Douglass, and Ciolek-Torrello (2009), which recounts this history in its own text, rather than to Wikipedia. (4) The Ávila/Guaspita/Rancho Sausal Redondo land-grant paragraph is substantially rewritten and re-sourced to a primary California State Archives land-grant record (Reference 18), the Pacific Coast Architecture Database (Reference 19), and a surveyed Huntington Library plat map showing "the Rancho called Guaspita" (Reference 20); this also corrected a second, previously uncaught error, where this report had followed Wikipedia's vague "in the 1820s" dating. The primary sources instead document an 1822 grazing permit followed by a formal 1837 land-grant patent from Governor Juan Alvarado. (5) The 2004 ancestral-remains discovery and 2021 reinterment/monument narrative is now cited to CURes Blog (Reference 21) instead of Wikipedia. (6) References 9 and 10 (the two Wikipedia articles previously cited) were, at that time, retained and labeled as unused rather than removed outright; that decision was revisited and superseded in v1.18.0. A new standing instruction has been recorded to never cite Wikipedia as a supporting source for any future Ballona/Tongva work.

v1.8.0 Corrected a geographic error: the report had stated Guaspet was "located at the mouth of Ballona Creek," a phrasing traceable to Wikipedia's "Guashna" article. Per the excavation report's own project description (Homburg et al. 2014, Vol. 1), the village site was approximately 0.5 km (0.3 mi) inland from the Pacific Ocean coastline, at the base of the Westchester Bluffs; the creek's actual ocean outlet lies several miles to the southwest, near present-day Del Rey Lagoon, between Playa del Rey and Marina del Rey, roughly 1.5 to 2 miles from the village site. Added precise project-area location data (distances to the Pacific Ocean, Baldwin Hills, and LAX; site elevation) and a location table to Section 1, added a map figure distinguishing the two locations, added Reference 15 and its URL, and added a row to the Section 2.1 source-verification table documenting the correction.

v1.7.0 Second Perplexity review adjudicated (post-v1.6.0 joint Claude/Perplexity/ChatGPT draft). Reviewer confirmed the factual base is at least as strong as v1.4.0 and that the 92-versus-193 discrepancy is handled correctly: stated explicitly rather than resolved, not converted into a false midpoint, and elevated to the top of the Recommendations. Five suggestions were adopted: added a sentence to "What This Report Does Not Claim" explicitly naming the title/content tension rather than leaving it implicit; added a caveat to the household (kiiy) proxy in Section 5 noting it comes from a public-facing summary, not a site-specific excavation plan, and should be cross-checked against primary Tongva ethnography; added an explicit scope-mismatch caveat to the 193-person figure; strengthened the Section 5 summary paragraph with explicit "source-bounded estimate" language; and gave Section 8's top recommendation a concrete plan. The retitling suggestion was raised a third time and is again not applied unilaterally; the title/content tension is instead addressed head-on in the Executive Summary itself.

v1.6.0 ChatGPT peer review adjudicated. Search-verification surfaced two significant findings: (1) Douglass and Reddy's chapter in The Global Spanish Empire (University of Arizona Press, 2020) independently corroborates the "over 90" recruitment figure; (2) a City of Inglewood EIR document states a materially different figure of 193 baptized residents, circa 1790-1820, which was not reconciled and is now flagged throughout. Also corrected

the tar-seep/Baldwin Hills hedge, corrected the New Mexico trade-network miscitation, and added the "What This Report Does Not Claim" section.

v1.5.0 Perplexity peer review adjudicated. Confirmed all core claims with no contradictions. Declined a suggestion to add a false-precision numeric population range ("40 to 120, mid-range 80"), since no source supports that precision.

v1.4.0 Full independent verification pass. Re-fetched full source text for every citation. Corrected a mistaken attribution of the "no baptismal-record support" caveat from Guashna to the separate name Sa'angna, and corrected a mischaracterization of the California Coastal Commission's April 2024 report, which had been wrongly cited as a source for "Friends of Ballona Wetlands litigation and a Playa Vista settlement framework" that it does not in fact discuss.

v1.3.0 Removed an unrequested "companion to the Ballona Creek Terminus Report" subtitle. Restored numbered footnote markers tied to the References list. Corrected section order: body sections, Photographs, References, Verified source URLs, Version Block and Changelog as the true final section.

v1.2.0 Reformatted to house style: named in-text citations, numbered sections, source-verification table, separate References and Verified source URLs lists, running page-style headers.

v1.1.0 Embedded photograph files directly into the document rather than displaying them only in chat. Moved References toward the end of the document.

v1.0.0 Initial issue of this report, built from verified primary and secondary sourcing. Population presented as a bounded estimate rather than a single documented figure. Village-abandonment date of 1819 presented as source-backed but scoped specifically to the end of recruitment and baptismal activity tied to Guaspet.